

MODERN CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and PROGRESS in the
Church of England.

"By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance."—*Erasmus*.

"A State without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation."—*Edmund Burke*.

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A.

CONTENTS.

THE RUGBY CONFERENCE.

Conference Themes.

The Difficulties of the Christian Teacher.

The Teaching of the Old and New Testaments.

The Teaching of the Creeds.

Kikuyu Problems. Joint Communion.

Reform in Lay Representation.

The Training of the Clergy.

CHRISTIANITY AND PATRIOTISM.

By the Very Rev. H. H. HENSON, D.D.

FACT AND INTERPRETATION.

By the Rev. H. C. TOWNSEND, B.D.

JOHN HUS.—By Rev. J. W. HUNKIN, M.A.

GOD IS SPIRIT.—By Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D.

REVIEW.—A Layman's Religion.

CORRESPONDENCE.

In preparation for the next Lambeth Conference.

Divine Providence.

Printer and Publisher: WILLIAM PARR, Knaresborough.

London Agents:—WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 14, Henrietta Street, W.C.

ELLIOT STOCK, 7, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Price 6d. net. Annual Subscription, 5/- (including postage).

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS HALL.]

Annual Subscription, 5/- (including postage).

President :—Professor GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

The Right Hon. LORD GREY, G.C.M.G., G.C.B., 22, South St., Park Lane W.
 Sir C. THOMAS DYKE-ACLAND, Bart., Holnicote, Taunton, Somerset.
 PHILIP H. BAGENAL, Esq., Harrogate.
 F. C. CHANNING, Esq., 62, Fellows Road, N.W.
 The Rev. Canon CREMER, Seaford Vicarage, Sussex.
 The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, 29, Egerton Gardens, Hendon, N.W.
 The Rev. Professor HENSLOW, Danehurst, Branksome Wood Road, Bournemouth.
 The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, Harvard University, U.S.A.
 The Rev. Dr. MORRISON, The Rectory, Marylebone, W.
 The Rev. Canon H. RASHDALL, Litt.D., F.B.A., New College, Oxford.

Members of the Council:

Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, The College, Ely (*Chairman*).

Rev. Dr. DUKENFIELD ASTLEY.
 Mr. P. H. BAGENAL.
 Rev. Canon BANNISTER.
 Rev. A. N. BAX.
 Rev. J. H. C. B. de CANDOLE.
 Prof. M. A. CANNEY.
 Mr. F. C. CHANNING.
 Rev. W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG.
 Rev. Canon CREMER.
 Prof. CRUICKSHANK.
 Rev. H. DALE.
 Rev. Canon W. DANKS.
 Rev. J. A. DODD.
 Rev. W. A. EDWARDS.
 Rev. C. W. EMMET.
 Rev. Canon FOAKES-JACKSON.
 Rev. JOHN GAMBLE.
 Mr. W. B. GORDON.
 Rev. H. HANDLEY.
 Rev. H. LAURENCE.
 Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR.

Rev. R. G. MILBURN.
 Rev. J. LLOYD MILNE.
 Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
 Rev. CAVENDISH MOXON.
 Very Rev. ARNOLD PAGE.
 Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
 Rev. Canon RASHDALL.
 Mrs. REITH.
 Rev. H. G. ROSEDALE.
 Rev. T. F. ROYDS.
 Rev. C. J. SHARP.
 Rev. C. R. SHAW-STEWART.
 Rev. A. H. STANWAY.
 Sir RICHARD STAPLEY.
 Rev. J. E. SYMES.
 Rev. J. M. THOMPSON.
 Rev. R. B. TOLLINTON.
 Mr. A. G. WIDGERY.
 Rev. J. R. WILKINSON.
 Rev. FERGUS WOOD.
 Miss YOUNGHUSBAND.

Hon. Treasurer :—Sir RICHARD STAPLEY, 33, Bloomsbury Square, W.C.

Hon. Solicitor.—SHIRLEY WOOLLMER, Esq., Temple Chambers, E.C.

Hon. Auditor.—ROBERT WARNER, Esq., F.C.A., 10, Walbrook, E.C.

Secretary.—The Rev. W. MANNING, M.A., The Rectory, Chipping Barnet, Herts.

OBJECTS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

- 1.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church to restate her belief from time to time as required by the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit.
- 2.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness and corporate life of the Church of England, and her Christian spirit of tolerance in all things non-essential.
- 3.—To give all support in their power to those who are honestly and loyally endeavouring to vindicate the truths of Christianity by the light of scholarship and research; and while paying due regard to continuity, to work for such changes in the formularies and practices in the Church of England as from time to time are made necessary by the needs and knowledge of the day.
- 4.—To assert the rights and duties of the laity as constituent members of the Body of Christ.
- 5.—To encourage friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

TERMS:

Member's **Annual Subscription** at least 5/-; Life Membership Subscription, £10. These should be paid to **Rev. W. Manning**, The Rectory, Chipping Barnet, Herts., Secretary of the Union.

"THE MODERN CHURCHMAN."

The Modern Churchman, the monthly organ of the Churchmen's Union, is sent free to all full members of the Union.

Editor :—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A., Copgrove Rectory, Burton Leonard, Yorks., to whom all literary contributions are to be sent.

Business Manager :—Rev. C. MOXON, M.A., Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire, receives all subscriptions, advts., changes of address, &c., for the *Modern Churchman*.

	PAGE.
The Rugby Conference :—	
Conference Themes	274
Teaching of the Old Testament	274
Teaching of the New Testament	275
Teaching of the Creeds	277
Kikuyu Problems	278
Joint Communion	280
Reform in Lay Representation	283
The Training of the Clergy	284
Christianity and Patriotism	287
Fact and Interpretation	304
John Hus	310
God is Spirit	320
Review:—A Layman's Religion... ..	325
Correspondence :—	
In preparation for the next Lambeth Conference	328
Divine Providence, etc.	328

The Modern Churchman.

LIBRARY

No. 6.

SEPTEMBER, 1915.

VOL. V.

THE RUGBY CONFERENCE.

In liberal Church circles the event of the month has been the Rugby Conference. This was held in most convenient and attractive surroundings, by kind permission of the Principals of the Laurels Girls' School; the perfect weather enabling full use to be made of the charming garden. The attendance at the Conference exceeded that of the Ripon Conference last year, the century being reached. Among those present were Professor Gardner, Canons Glazebrook, Papillon, and Rashdall, Sir Richard Stapley, the Headmasters of Rugby, Sherborne, and Bristol, the Dean of Peterboro', Chancellor Hoernlé, Canons James Adderley and Bannister, Miss Alice Gardner, Miss Emery, Miss Younghusband, the Revs. W. A. Cunningham Craig, A. Fawkes, W. C. Roberts, R. Seaver, J. E. Symes, J. M. Thompson, Frome Wilkinson, Fergus Wood, Hubert Handley (Chaplain of the Conference), Canon Foakes Jackson (Chairman of the Conference Meetings), Mesdames Moxon, Major, Reith (Conference Reception Committee), Miss Dora Nussey (Treasurer and Secretary), and Mr. P. H. Bagenal (Press Secretary).

The Conference opened at 6 p.m. on Monday, September 6th, in Holy Trinity Church, with a spiritual and sympathetic address by the Rev. A. A. David, D.D., Headmaster of Rugby. At nine o'clock the same evening the Presidential Address was delivered at the Laurels, by Professor Percy Gardner.

The President began by justifying the holding of the Conference during war-time, on the ground that those attending it were unable personally to take part in military duty. Moreover, in the present crisis, when all the principles of their lives, the very foundations of religion and ethics, were being tested to the uttermost, it was essential for Broad Churchmen to re-examine their principles, and to make their contribution to the reconstruction which must follow the terrible shocks in which all things that were easily shaken were likely to perish. In this connection he spoke of the volume shortly to be brought out by the Churchmen's Union, under the editorship of Canon Foakes Jackson, dealing with the profound religious questions raised by the war, especially the difficulties suggested by it in regard to the divine government of the world.

He next referred briefly to the questions to be discussed at the Conference, and concluded by deploring the present perversion of intellect and science for

the wholesale destruction of men, and suggested the possibility of an order or brotherhood of researchers in history and science, pledged to abstain from all personal gain, and to devote their efforts to the preservation of life, and its more complete spiritualization.

The address, which lasted nearly an hour, dealt in a most suggestive way with such problems of pressing importance as the aftermath of the war, the relations between German militarism and German theology, the weakness of popular English Christianity, and was listened to with deep attention.

CONFERENCE THEMES.

On the following Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday three groups of subjects were considered by the Conference. These were (1) The difficulties of the Christian teacher in the face of new knowledge and changing outlook.

(2) The problem of how to secure closer relationships between divided Christian communions.

(3) The need for urgent reforms in (a) the representation of the laity, (b) the training of ordinands.

The difficulties of the Christian teacher were treated in six papers. The first two were devoted to difficulties in connection with the Old Testament.

I.—TEACHING OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The first of these papers was read by Canon Glazebrook, D.D. (late Headmaster of Clifton), and was limited to the teaching of the Old Testament in Secondary Schools.

CANON GLAZEBROOK advised that where the age of leaving is about 18, the teaching of the Old Testament should be so planned that pupils, who have gone through the normal course, may enter life equipped with a knowledge of the leading facts and the leading ideas for which the Old Testament stands. They need a connected view of Israelite history. They need a real familiarity with the text, and an appreciation of it as literature. They should have realised that the Old Testament is not all on one level, but contains a record of the process of revelation, by which the Hebrews were led up from fetishism and polytheism to the ethical monotheism, which was the necessary preparation for the Gospel. They should have seen how the Law, no suddenly given code, grew up by a gradual development, adapting itself to new conditions.

The bulk and difficulty of the Hebrew Scriptures make it impossible to read more than a fraction of them in the course of ordinary lessons. At the same time the interweaving, in most of the historical books, of narratives composed in different ages and from different points of view, cause much confusion and inconsistency. Unless much time is to be wasted, and

children's minds troubled by the premature raising of critical questions, the history must be taught from a simplified text selected on critical principles, so as to give a consecutive and consistent narrative.

Only in the last stage of school life should pupils be introduced to questions of criticism. When they have a competent knowledge of the history, they can with advantage study the progress of theology and ethics in the prophets, and the changes in worship and social order in the Law.

The second paper on the teaching of the Old Testament was by the Rev. A. FAWKES, Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers. It took a wider range and was of a less technical character. The reader pointed out that the moral difficulties presented by the Old Testament are a real danger, particularly to the half-educated. To gauge them we must not confine ourselves to the semi-apologetic criticism of University Professors, but go down to the intellectual standard of the secularist press; for this is what the masses read. The spavined apologetic, dear to the elderly Christian, is useless; it is not a question of making concessions, but of acknowledging and explaining facts. The key to the Old Testament is given by Comparative Religion, and by the conception of the universal flux of human affairs. What is permanent in religion is not content, but direction; we live in a Godward moving world.

Yet these early records have certain lasting values.

(1) The Old Testament is the first attempt at a philosophy of religion and history.

(2) It knows nothing of an inspiration that is a bar to progressive thinking: Ezekiel dismisses Moses with costs.

(3) It has no hell and no devil—in the sense of an arch-enemy of God and man—at the head of a host of evil spirits.

(4) It has no trace of occultism—"The obscene supernatural," which has left its trail on so much early religion.

(5) Its emphasis on corporate rather than personal immortality is a corrective to certain aspects of later religion; there is in our modern religion a care for individual salvation that is meticulous and mean.

What criticism takes away is the mere confectionery of the pulpit; the word of God remains. And we may say with Renan—that it is to the critics, to those who see Israel in her true beauty, that it belongs in truth to say, "Our feet shall stand in thy gates, O Jerusalem."

II.—THE TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The next two papers were devoted to the New Testament.

The subject of the New Testament in the Pulpit was treated by the Rev. J. GAMBLE, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Leighwoods, Bristol, who urged that the treatment of the New Testament by the preacher must be determined by the needs of his listeners. He must meet their thoughts and lead them

onwards from the point they have already reached. He cannot presuppose knowledge which they do not possess, nor can he hope to find acceptance for ideas with which they are quite unfamiliar. A common measure of knowledge and belief must be found between speakers and listeners.

The average worshipper does not bring with him to Church a student's knowledge of the New Testament. He has not studied the book either at school or afterwards. He does, however, bring with him what is of greater importance, a religion. This religion is nominally based upon the New Testament. In reality it is the result of experience, inherited and acquired. He has received it from his parents. He transmits it, substantially unchanged, to his children. This religion the preacher strives to establish, inform and correct. The instrument put into his hands for these purposes is the New Testament. He places the religion of to-day side by side with that revealed in this book, as we may place a copy by the side of its original.

The New Testament cannot be regarded apart from the Christian experience gained since it was composed. It is not an unalterable law which we have to interpret. It must be viewed in the light of the subsequent history into which it entered and which it helped to shape. The original meaning of its words is only the first link of a long chain of meanings which must be sought in the Church's history. The preacher's first step is to view the words in their primitive sense, and to exhibit this sense to his hearers. He should interpret the words with scientific impartiality. This, however, is only a stage in his progress. His goal is only reached when he has brought himself and his listeners into the presence of the Eternal Christ, who belongs to all ages, and whose voice, whenever it is heard, calls forth a heartfelt Amen.

The second paper on the New Testament was read by Mr. NOWELL SMITH, Headmaster of Sherborne School, who desired to put before the Conference the point of view of a layman untrained in theology, who only took up the teaching of the New Testament on becoming Headmaster of a Public School. The first necessity was to have a practical interest in the subject, not only an intellectual interest in linguistic, historical, doctrinal problems, valuable as such an interest was, but a burning conviction that for teacher and taught, here in the New Testament are "words of eternal life." The absence of such a practical interest was the chief defect of school teaching; and the chief cause of that absence was the mechanical view of religious facts still largely held. The bugbear of orthodoxy tended to frighten teachers, especially laymen, into mere repetition of second-hand dogma or avoidance of any religious expression whatever.

Thus the necessary support of a practical interest in the New Testament was the spirit of free enquiry; and the Churchmen's Union would foster this, by giving the layman some shelter against the real or fancied disapproval of organised orthodoxy.

The writer concluded by expressing his conviction that the supposed danger of unsettling the minds of the young by admitting the spirit of free enquiry was an unreal one, pointing out that the revelation of God, to which the New Testament bears witness, could only be made a living part of a person's life by the co-operation of his own intelligence, and that, although in discussions of the problem of teaching, attention was necessarily focussed upon difficulties, in practice the positive and agreed content of the New Testament for all stages of individual growth far outweighed such difficulties.

III.—TEACHING OF THE CREEDS.

The problem of how to teach the Creeds was dealt with in the next two papers.

The teaching of the Creeds, especially to the young, was dealt with by Mr. C. NORWOOD, Headmaster of Bristol Grammar School. The modern teacher of the Creeds, it was urged, must accept fully the saying of Bishop Westcott that formulas which in earlier times seemed to declare the Gospel adequately, no longer cover the facts of the world as they have been revealed to us in these later days. The best foundation will be laid if the young are thoroughly taught the life and teaching of Jesus Christ directly from the Gospels, and if emphasis is laid on the chief beliefs only, namely, the Fatherhood of God, our Redemption through Christ, our sanctification by the Holy Spirit. As children grow older, the ideals involved in such articles of the Creed as the Holy Catholic Church should be explained, but no attempt should be made to deal with difficulties before they arise in the natural order of the mind's development. Then they should be faced. We should teach what the Creeds are, historically, and we should explain that, while the object of thought remains the same, its expression in language is necessarily relative to each generation. We should distinguish between the various articles of the Creed, and point out that some are of greater importance than others, and should lay especial emphasis upon the most important. We should point out that others are concerned with the mode of the manifestation of Christ upon earth, and are patient of more than one interpretation, which we should impart; but we should be careful to lay stress on the fact that in all of them, while there is an outer husk of verbal statement which is of its own age and locality, there is also an inner kernel of essential truth which is of all ages.

The second paper dealing with the Creeds was contributed by Mr. ALBAN G. WIDGERY, M.A., who was, unfortunately, unable to be present. The paper was read by the Rev. C. Moxon.

Mr. Widgery was convinced that Liberal Churchmen must take up the challenge of the Bishop of Oxford, and make their principles known to the rank and file of the religious world. The principles of free study, established for the Old and New Testaments, must be applied to the traditional creeds.

Creeds, as statements of the fundamentals of the religious life of a society, are desirable and necessary. Simple exposition concerning the belief in God, Jesus, forgiveness, and life everlasting, may be given to the young. But the best time—for those who seek to cultivate a free and intelligent acceptance of religious beliefs—for the serious consideration of the creeds is in preparation for confirmation, which, if it is to be effective, ought to be some years after adolescence; in Bible Classes; and in the pulpit. In the two last mentioned there is an urgent call for more discussion of fundamentals. The articles of the Creeds are not all of like value; they should be kept in a proper perspective. Symbolical interpretation should be resorted to only when no other is possible. The essentials of Christian Theism contained in the Creeds should be the main subjects of instruction. In discussing articles, the truth or religious significance of which are open to doubt, denial should be avoided. The case for the traditional, and the case for the modern views should be stated, and men—who should be treated as men—left to decide for themselves. The teacher's own view will most often be apparent. The time will come for openly declaring one's personal views on some of these articles, but it is not yet. It will be when the form that the National Church is to take in the future becomes a live problem for the country. The National Church concerns the nation as a whole. A clear and full statement of the liberal attitude to the Creeds and the Church is an urgent necessity for all those who desire to minister to the needs of modern religious life, to aid liberal Churchmen in teaching Christian fundamentals, and to unite with other free religious movements.

KIKUYU PROBLEMS.

Four papers were devoted to Kikuyu Problems. The first two dealt with the relations of the Church to Nonconformists in respect of teaching and preaching, the second two in relation to joint Communion.

The first paper was read by the Rev. T. F. ROYDS, B.D., Vicar of Bollington, Altrincham, who began by pointing out that the barrier between the Church and Nonconformity is largely a social one. The average Nonconformist is not a schismatic; he has inherited his religion. Schism consists rather in party-spirit within the Church than in peaceful separation from it. Reabsorption must not be expected.

The theological foundations of the Oxford Movement have been broken up, and we need a Rugby Movement, dedicated to the memory of Dr. Arnold. Much united study and prayer must precede any action. There should be more friendly controversy between ministers *in camera*.

Exchange of pulpits is not wrong in principle, but the time is not yet ripe for it. Resolutions Nos. 76 and 77 of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 are excellent; but we must not deny to a Nonconformist body the name of Church. Class-distinctions are ineradicable, but Christianity aims at

ignoring them as far as possible. Nonconformists must help us to do this. They must avoid preaching politics, class-hatred, and anti-patriotism, and be content to preach Christ and Him crucified. All must be pervaded by charity and humility.

United war services are helpful, and should certainly include extempore prayer by Nonconformist ministers. There must be no proselytising, although there should be much intercourse.

With regard to school-teaching, the main questions are:—(1) What is best for the children? (2) What is possible for the average teacher? The rights of denominations are secondary, although this is often forgotten in sectarian strife. Pastoral sympathy with *all* his parishioners is the duty of every incumbent, and the Prayer for Unity in the Accession Service should be in constant use.

The second paper was read by the Rev. J. M. JEAKES, M.A., who maintained that the closer study of the beginnings of the Christian Church has shown us that the various parts of it, now existing among us, are all developments of the one seed which Christ sowed, and we cannot say of any one of them that it is the only legitimate development of that seed.

Therefore, in our teaching and preaching (1) we shall defend our own form of Church order on the ground that it is justified by past experience and that in it is our best hope of ordered liberty for the future. But we shall not condemn the ministry of other Christian bodies as "invalid." We shall teach our people to recognise in them "*other parts of the Church of Christ.*" (2) As a matter of principle we shall claim for their authorised ministers the right, upon proper invitation, to address our congregations; and we shall claim for ourselves a like freedom to address theirs. There might be preliminary difficulties, but, these being overcome, the practice would soon become a normal and helpful element in our Church life. Meanwhile members of Nonconformist congregations might more frequently worship at our Church services, and our people at theirs. Each has something to give which the other lacks. (3) "Inter-denominational courtesy" must never be forgotten. In the controversy, *e.g.*, about Disestablishment, let us—on both sides—bind ourselves by the famous clause of Penn's Treaty with the Indians—"not to believe evil reports one of another." (4) The anti-Christian forces of to-day are attacking, not this or that outwork, but the ground on which all Christians stand. The Christian morality is frankly challenged, and the last year has made it clear enough that, if the Christian faith is repudiated, the Christian rule of conduct will not for long survive it. This is a call to *all* Christian teachers to take counsel together, that the whole Church may put forth all its strength against the common enemy.

Our immediate aim is not unity of form, but *unity of spirit*. But Christian teachers must prepare themselves and their people to go further than that,

if and when God wills it. A Christian Church which should unite all the Christian forces of the Nation has been the ideal of many great Churchmen; and if, at the return of peace, the Nation (having learnt what civilization apart from faith means) is prepared to take the Christian faith more seriously than it has ever taken it yet, such a Church will be among the possibilities of the future. Only, it cannot be *made* by the wit of man. It must *grow* out of existing conditions, according to the will of God.

JOINT COMMUNION.

Canon BANNISTER, of Hereford, read the first of the two papers on Joint Communion. He held that abstract arguments for Inter-Communion were needless in such an assembly; his task was rather to show that to establish Inter-Communion as a custom is the most presently practicable step towards religious unity in the nation. It is the business of the Churchmen's Union, not anxiously to follow precedents but to make them. One of its "objects" is—very wisely—not to work for "re-union" or formal federation, but "to encourage friendly relations." These should be, in the first instance, with our Christian neighbours at home rather than with Roman or Russian Christians abroad, and surely, for Christians "friendly relations" imply praying together. Let us once begin to pray together, and many other things will follow of themselves, and the highest act of common prayer is to kneel together at the table of the Lord.

For some time any action in this direction must be the action of individuals such as that of Stanley in 1870, of the Bishop of Hereford in 1911, and, recently, of the Christians at Kikuyu. What prevents us from arranging many such gatherings? Simply fear of the separatists, with their exclusive theory of apostolical succession. This theory is the last remaining barrier to practical Christian unity. But we have no right to subordinate the interests of religion in England to the arrogant assumption of the separatist clergy.

"But will they secede!" We must take the risk of that, since the only alternative is acquiescence in their ascendancy, which means the denationalizing of the Church. In any action we take we shall have the overwhelming majority of the lay people with us. The Confirmation Rubric, which might seem to stand in our way, was taken by the leading Archbishops and Bishops of the 19th century as of domestic application only, to our own people. But we must be prepared, if we invite our Nonconformist neighbours to join us at the Lord's Table, to have the invitation returned.

At the present time our suffering and sacrifices in the War have drawn together men of widely different opinions, and have strengthened the longing after unity, the spirit of comradeship. Are we of the National Church to remain the only separatists in the Nation?

The second paper on joint communion was read by Rev. Canon CREMER, Vicar of Seaford. At the outset, the reader indicated that in the Lord's Supper, as in all our Church life as Christians, there is the Divine Command resting on principle, and there are "the traditions and commandments of men" which vary with conditions of time and place and expediency. So long as we do not "make the Divine Command of none effect by our traditions," we members of the Churchmen's Union are loyal and willing conformists to prescribed rules of Church Order. But we go back fearlessly to historical facts and first principles and test the fashions and customs of present-day Christianity by the light of sound knowledge and learning. As Dr. David reminded us in his opening address, we bring everything into Christ's presence and try it by the touchstone of Christ's revelation. He dared to oppose those who sat in Moses' seat when their sabbatarian or other ceremonial traditions bound on men's shoulders unreasonable burdens inconsistent with God's Revealed Will. We try to walk in His footsteps.

To apply this more closely, the qualifications and conditions with which the Christian Church, in various times and places and in various manners, has fenced the Feast Christ ordained, are an entirely human provision of expediency with a view to ensure reverence. The breaking and sharing of a loaf after giving thanks to God; the pouring out and passing round of "the fruit of the vine" in connection with the quiet fellowship of a meal; the solemn calling of the loaf His body, and the cup the new covenant in His blood; the doing this in remembrance of Him. This is no device of our fellowmen, however wise, devout, or authoritative, but is the "law of the feast" as enunciated by the feast's own founder. We can bind ourselves by no commandments and precepts of men that make His ordinance of love and fellowship of none effect.

The Church has power to decree rites and ceremonies, but only so long as she prescribes nothing contrary to God's Word written (Article XX.).

In the latter half of his paper, the speaker gave a brief account of the various attempts he had made in the course of his ministry to realise the inwardness of the words: "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples if ye have love one to another."

Canon GLAZEBROOK, speaking at the conclusion of the debate, gave utterance to a view which differed from those of Canons Bannister and Cremer on practical grounds. He pointed out that when French philosophers of the eighteenth century sought a historical basis for "the rights of man," they were driven from one position after another until they took refuge in Adam, about whom they were free to imagine whatever they pleased. Some modern High Churchmen, also defeated by history, have in like manner devised an abstract ideal of what is "catholic," independent of particular times, from which they can draw the conclusions they desire. Mr. Cremer's paper seems to show that there is a similar tendency at work among

ourselves. Though we admit that the record of Our Lord's words cannot be literally exact, we are tempted to distil an abstract notion of what is primitive by pressing the literal sense of that record. Let us be warned against that error by the experience of others, and try to find a better way of solving modern problems. To the claim of abstract rights for man, Burke justly replied: "The rights of man in societies are their advantages." The same principle applies to the Church. Members of our Union, at least, cannot logically appeal to primitive practice as a final court, even if we were sure what that practice was. For if, as we are fond of repeating, the Holy Spirit is slowly leading the Church into all truth, we may not disregard the ordered systems which have been gradually built up in nineteen centuries. However imperfect still, they have authority in our esteem as part of the great process of continuous revelation: and greatest for us is the authority of the system to which we belong. The law of our conduct must not be any abstract ideal of what is primitive or what is catholic, but what is best for our Church at this time—that is, most in accordance with the will of Our Lord as gradually revealed.

What solution of the problems about Communion is best for our Church? I know some things which are not best. Canon Bannister has rightly said: "Reconciliation with Rome means submission." The principle applies equally just now to our relations with Nonconformity: and surely submission is not best, nor what we desire.

Again, it is not best that a special use of the Lord's Table should become the flag of a party, a symbol of division. I do not speak as one who is opposed to all Inter-communion. For fifteen years at Clifton I welcomed both boys and masters who were Presbyterians when they wished to communicate. I believe that Inter-communion is right when those who join together are already united by a common life, as at Clifton; by common work, as at Kikuyu; or by common suffering, as in Flanders to-day. In such cases it is the seal set upon a parchment which is ready written. But if you try to seal where no such parchment is, you only burn your fingers. So inter-communion which anticipates the union of souls, in the mere hope of producing union, is likely to do harm. And if such services are held as part of a demonstration, the sacrament is lowered to be the flag of a party, and we are threatened with evils which recall the Test Act.

As members of the Church of England we are more bound to our fellow-Churchmen than to other Christians. If we do not think so, we ought to change our allegiance. And there can be no doubt that such demonstrations would hurt the most cherished feelings of a majority. The waving of that flag would effect no real reconciliation with Nonconformists, and would provoke such a conflict in our own Church as might cause a further division in the body of Christ.

REFORM IN LAY REPRESENTATION.

Mr. W. B. GORDON, of Ilkley, who read the first paper on this subject, urged that in considering whether a system of Representation of Laymen was needed, the Church must be considered as a whole, and the Laity as an integral part of it having a duty as well as a right to assume some part in its deliberations. The higher and more strictly spiritual departments were properly for the clergy, yet even on those subjects it would be well that laymen should be allowed a responsible judgment, as the subjects closely affected their vital interests. Moreover, their lack of technical knowledge and theological learning may often be balanced by experience of life. The speaker next passed to a survey of the different branches of Church organization, and urged that in all of them laymen had a right to a voice in the shaping of policy. He referred to the institution of the Representative Church Council, and to its scheme for Representation of the Laity, and hoped that strong efforts would be made to make the scheme known and rouse the interest of the laity in it, as well as to induce the clergy to co-operate in shewing that the representation should be a reality. He also pleaded that the scheme could not be a success unless the deliberations of all the representative bodies were allowed to end in something more than mere abstract resolutions.

Miss K. M. EMERY, daughter of Archdeacon Emery, the founder of the Church Congress, read the second paper on Lay Representation. At the outset she was at some pains to shew, although St. Paul had affirmed that in Christ there is neither male nor female, that women do constitute a part of the laity, and therefore are entitled to be represented on the Church's representative bodies. With remarkable lucidity she explained the intricate and ingenious means by which laymen are as the effect of a five-fold operation elected to the Representative Church Council—the final result being that the laymen there are more representative of clericalism than even the Houses of Convocation themselves.

So far as the representation of women is concerned, the present scheme is full of anomalies. Some dioceses still follow the scheme of representation passed by the Representative Church Council in 1903, by which women "owners and occupiers" can exercise the parochial lay-franchise; some have adopted the new scheme passed in July, 1914, by which women have the parochial lay-franchise on the same terms as men, and can serve on Parochial Church Councils, but not as lay representatives to Ruri-decanal and Diocesan Conferences; some desire to take this further step and give women equality with laymen in the Councils of the Church of England (though not always in equal proportion).

The laity should use to the full the powers already granted, and make Parochial Church Councils a reality. Only the really keen and intelligent

women will take the trouble to vote or to serve. Fitness to serve is a question of personality, not of sex. Women already do the main part of lay work for the Church and therefore can speak from experience. Diocesan and Ruri-decanal Conferences could appoint a few women as *ex-officio* or co-opted members, both on their own bodies and on committees. Co-option, or selection, has the great advantage of accustoming men to work with women they trust, and gradually disabuses them of misconceptions as to feminine unfitness for these functions.

The Free Churches give women equal voting power in the congregations and appoint women on Central Committees.

The laity, men and women alike, should take their share in the spiritual and intellectual life of the Church as well as in its social work and financial responsibilities.

THE TRAINING OF THE CLERGY.

The Training of the Clergy was dealt with in two papers. The first was read by the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, Vice-Principal of Ripon Clergy College, who confined himself to the theological side of that training.

Having observed that the present method of theological training, owing to its obscurantist and sectarian tendencies, made the clergy neither efficient teachers of the Christian Religion nor successful seekers of Christian Unity, he urged a drastic reformation in the theological college curriculum. He maintained that the whole range of studies and examinations should be greatly widened, and that students should be taught principles instead of details. Their course should begin with the comprehensive study of religion, treated historically, comparatively, psychologically, and philosophically. Much more emphasis than at present should be placed on the study of the principles of Jesus, and their application to our modern ecclesiastical, social, and international problems. He did not anticipate, however, that the episcopate as a whole would immediately act on these suggestions, but hoped that several of the bishops might be induced to co-operate with the authorities of one or more of the theological colleges to make such a reform, and pleaded that broad-minded, influential, and wealthy laymen should give it their support.

The second paper on the Training of Ordinands was read by the Rev. R. G. PARSONS, Principal of Wells Theological College. He was convinced that uniformity in the training of candidates was a profound mistake. The English Church with its various phases and divisions of opinion demanded variety of training. What was needed above all was greater efficiency, and the realisation of a higher standard. Present systems and present results seemed to him quite inadequate. Meanness and meagreness characterised most of the training offered, and men were ordained with little technical knowledge, and still less knowledge of human nature.

The Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, one of the Inspectors of Theological Colleges recently appointed by the Upper House of Convocation, made a speech indicating that the present system of teaching in the Theological Colleges was, in his opinion, far from satisfactory.

On the last evening of the Conference practical measures for advancing our cause were discussed. It was generally felt that these must take the form of organisation and education rather than of agitation. After all our movement is mainly one not of protest and negation, but of illumination and inspiration.

Dealing with practical measures, the Rev. CAVENDISH MOXON pleaded for the formation of branches of the Union in the various centres of population with the object of creating a great body of liberal Church opinion, which would take the place of the prevailing indifference and discontent. The extension of the circulation of the *Modern Churchman* by the personal influence of its readers might, he felt, do much to help the movement.

The Rev. C. W. EMMET advocated that the Liberal Clergy should use the opportunities afforded by regular attendance at their Ruri-decanal Chapters, Diocesan Conferences, Societies of Sacred Study, and Clerical Meetings generally, to make known their ideals. He held it to be a mistake for a liberal clergyman, because his views were suspect or disliked, to withdraw from the society of his clerical brethren, as he thereby gained the reputation of being a disloyal or indifferent clergyman, and so discredited the liberal Church cause.

In his concluding speech, Dr. Foakes-Jackson, the Chairman of the Conference Meetings, congratulated the organizers of the Conference, and all who by giving their services had contributed to its success.

Votes of thanks were passed by the Conference to the Rector of Rugby, and to the Vicar of St. Matthew's, for permission to use their churches for the daily Eucharist and evening prayer. In connection with these services the thanks of all are especially due to the four Conference preachers—Dr. David, Canon Adderley, Canon Papillon, and the Rev. Hubert Handley. The Address of each had its clear and needful note. The first was welcoming, the second warning, the third calming, the fourth inspiring.

Our thanks are due to Dr. David, not only for his sermon, but also for his courtesy in personally conducting the Conference members over the school buildings and in permitting them the use of the school grounds, which almost adjoined our place of meeting.

To the Principals of the Laurels Girls' School we owe a great debt of gratitude for the generous loan of their buildings, and for their excellent and attentive servants.

Our thanks are also due to Mr. S. R. Hart, Headmaster of the Lower School, who presided at our Rugby Public Meeting, which had for its aim the setting forth of the ideals of the Churchmen's Union, and to Professor

Ashley, chairman of our meeting held in Birmingham University, when Canon Foakes-Jackson read a paper on "The Providence of God and the War."

Considering the many difficulties in the way of holding the Conference at the present time, we have every reason to feel thankful that so many were able to attend and that its proceedings were of so helpful and inspiring a character. Once more we were reminded that if the ideals of the Churchmen's Union do not prevail it will not be because the ideals are not sound, but because the faith, courage, energy, wisdom, self-sacrifice required to present them adequately are lacking. The moral of the Rugby Conference is writ clear in Clough's lines :—

"If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars;
It may be, in yon smoke conceal'd,
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,
And, but for you, possess the field!"

We regret that we have found it impossible in the space at our command to give any account of the discussion which followed the papers. Different points of view were set forth with tolerance and humour, and the speeches of Chancellor Hoernlé on the significance of reciting the Creed, and that of the Rev. J. M. Thompson on the need of absolute sincerity in Christian teaching, will not soon be forgotten. We hope next month to publish a Conference Number of the *Modern Churchman*, which will contain the President's Address, Mr. Handley's Sermon, and as many of the fourteen papers as our space allows.

* * Canon Cremer has kindly furnished us with the passage to which he referred in the discussion on the reform of the Lectionary.

AN ADMONITION TO ALL MINISTERS ECCLESIASTICAL.

"For that the Lord doth require of His servant, whom He hath set over His household to show both faithfulness and prudence in his office; it shall be necessary that ye above all other do behave yourselves most faithfully and diligently in your so high a function: *i.e.*, aptly, plainly and distinctly to read the Sacred Scriptures, diligently to instruct the youth in their catechism, gravely and reverently to minister His most holy Sacraments, prudently also to choose out such homilies as be most meet for the time. . . . and where it may so chance some one or other chapter of the Old Testament to fall in order to be read upon the sundays or holy days, which were better to be changed with some other of the New Testament of more edification, it shall be well done to spend your time to consider well of such chapters beforehand, whereby your prudence and diligence in your office may appear, so that your people may have cause to glorify God for you and be the readier to embrace your labours, to your better commendation to the discharge of your consciencies and their own."—*Preface to 2nd Book of Homilies.*

CHRISTIANITY IN RELATION TO PATRIOTISM AND WAR—

THE SUPREME TEST OF PATRIOTISM.*

By the Very Reverend H. HENSLEY HENSON, D.D., Dean of Durham.

The circumstances in which I address you to-day must serve as the justification of my choice of subject. In ordinary times I should have preferred to speak on some topic more immediately bearing on the work of the Christian Ministry, but on this occasion I feel compelled to bring my words into more direct relation with the terrible conflict which must needs fill our minds. What is the bearing of Christianity on Patriotism, and on War, which is the supreme test of Patriotism? How far can the inculcation of patriotic duty fitly enter into the work of a Christian Minister? How shall we reconcile the theory and practice of War with the Gospel of Peace? The answer to these questions may seem obvious enough to the enthusiastic patriot, aflame with indignation against the national enemy, and full of generous zeal for the national cause. But to the informed and considering Christian the questions raise a truly formidable difficulty, and they constitute a practical problem of equal urgency and complexity for the Christian Minister.

The Pastoral Letter recently issued by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, calling the clergy to arrange public intercessions for the Allies has not escaped criticism in quarters entitled to respect. A letter signed by four Cambridge scholars is but one indication of a mental disturbance which is very widely extended. The writers maintain that the Archbishops, in espousing the National cause, are untrue to the Catholic

*An Address delivered to the Students of the Yorkshire United Independent College, on the occasion of the Annual Meeting, June 30th, 1915, by Herbert Hensley Henson, D.D., Dean of Durham.

character of Christianity. The Gospel is international, and must not be bent to the service of any smaller interest:—

“Is the voice of Christ still coming to us through the Catholic Church? Or has danger and stress altered the message of the Prince of Peace? This is the question in the minds of many who now find their vision of a universal message ruthlessly torn from them by those who are its chief guardians.

“To such the Church of Christ is a Universal Church. In it there can be but one race, but one colour, but one living soul. *For the Christian there can be no spiritual compromise whatever with limited systems of race, nation, or state.* This is the essential ideal of Catholicity. The followers of Christ exist in the world *to preach and practice the spiritual brotherhood and equality of man.* Their message cannot be affected by wars, economic tyrannies, or any struggle which has its origin in things of this world. No one would have denied this view of the faith twelve months ago. Everyone will start automatically to preach it after the war. Yet to-day in all lands we see the accredited officials of the Church recanting this creed, and *absolutely identifying Christian morality with the needs and hopes of nations*, bartering the faith universal for the doctrine of necessity and of national survival in this world.”*

Such language is more emphatic than lucid, more suggestive of strong feeling than of hard thinking. For if we admit that “for the Christian there can be no spiritual compromise whatever with limited systems of race, nation, or state,” we may none the less maintain that it is precisely such “spiritual compromise” which is required to justify the acquiescence of a Christian man in a flagrant violation of the universal and immutable Law of Right. Not acquiescence, but resolute opposition, is in that case implied in spiritual loyalty, and the circumstance that our own nation champions the Right does not clothe that championship with a merely national character. Granting that “the needs and hopes of nations” cannot be simply identified with Christian morality, it yet remains possible that they may either harmonize or conflict with that morality. A Christian man’s attitude must be determined, not by the national or racial, but by the moral aspect of any policy which claims his support. The German aggression must be resisted, not because it is German, but because it involves the violation of treaties, and the oppression of smaller nations. We may,

* *v. The Challenge*, June 11th, 1915.

and ought to, admit that there is great risk of partisanship when an Englishman decides between his own nation and any other, but this risk is incidental to all human judgment, and must be accepted as part of our normal difficulty when we attempt to live the Christian life. It cannot excuse us from the responsibility of deciding our course. Right is right, however hard it may be to trace it in the complicated affairs of secular life; and our allegiance is always to the right as we can perceive it. The moral quality of national action cannot be simply ignored in the interest of a "spiritual" cosmopolitanism, for moral quality is integral to the spiritual validity of all human action, whether individual or national. But we must ask whether Christianity is rightly conceived of as wholly indifferent to patriotic considerations. Assuredly there will be few persons who will maintain such indifference in the closely analogous case of family relationship. The Christian as such is not shut off from the specific obligations of his domestic situation. Although there is, as St. Paul says, "No male and female in Christ Jesus," yet sexual morality, with its careful recognition of the specific difference of physiological function and social duty, forms an integral part of Christian morality. In the political sphere also there are obligations which receive from Christ, not cancellation but solemn consecration. "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's," is a far-reaching commandment, which pre-supposes for the Christian the burdens as well as the privileges of civilized citizenship. All this is indeed elementary, yet it seems to be forgotten by the authors of the letter I have quoted.

Yet there is some justification for the suspicion with which many devout and thoughtful men regard the eager support of the national cause by the leaders of English Christianity. Mainly, however confident we may be in the rightness of our cause, we must admit that the carriage of the churches of Christendom in this dreadful juncture has not been impressive, nay, has been disconcerting. The trial has not come in this country, if (as we are fully persuaded), this country is fighting

for the right; for no great significance attaches to the attitude of a Church which *ex hypothesi* is only called upon to perform the easy and welcome task of "going with the multitude." But in Germany and Austria, the cause (as we must see it) is widely different. There the gravest moral issues have been raised by the perfidy which violated the integrity of Belgium, and by the fearful atrocities which have marked the conduct of the German armies in Belgium and France. Yet no audible protest has come from the German and Austrian Churches. The only utterances of ecclesiastics and theologians which have reached us have been apologies for the moral infamies which attach to German diplomacy and German warfare. So far as we know, some halting criticism from a few Socialists is all the support which morality has received in Germany and Austria since the war began. In some respects the "neutrality" of the Pope is still more disquieting, for it does not need to be a Roman Catholic in order to feel the attraction of the theory which establishes on earth a Tribunal pledged to bring home to the nations, with the authority of a Divine Commission, the sovereign claims of that Justice which is the principle of all sound policy, and the foundation of all stable society. Here, when an International Treaty was brazenly violated, and every restraining tradition of humanity ostentatiously cast aside, when every extremity of oppression was being inflicted on an innocent but powerless people, here, I say, was an opportunity, manifest to all the world, for a solemn and authoritative censure from that August Pastor, whose title to speak in Christ's name is owned by the majority of Christians, and in this connection would have been denied by none. The Pope has failed to seize his opportunity, and has brought his great office into universal contempt. There will be a Nemesis on so tragic a failure. "Curse ye Meroz, saith the Angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, the help of the Lord against the mighty." We cannot wonder at, we ought not to resent, the concern with which devout men, jealous for the

integrity of the Christian Name, see the Churches endorsing, as it were automatically, the policies and procedures of the nations.

The man of the world is quick to mark the incongruity of mere nationalism and a Religion which claims to have a message for all mankind, and he is ready with his scornful comment. Last week I read these words in a newspaper article:—

“The opinion of the Church does not matter. There is no longer a Church of Christ. There is a Church of England, a Church of Germany, a Church of Russia, of Italy, and of France, colouring their humanity with their political convictions and their patriotic desires.”

In no respect, perhaps, is the attitude of modern Christians more sharply distinguished from that of their earliest co-religionists, than in respect to patriotism and war, which is the supreme test of patriotism. No paradox is more afflicting than that which is here presented by the history of the Christian Religion. A brief consideration of this paradox may, perhaps, not unfitly engage our thoughts on this occasion.

II.

In his well-known *History of European Morals*, Lecky discusses the influence of the Christian Religion on the theory and practice of war. He arrives at a rather depressing conclusion:—

“In looking back, with our present experience, we are driven to the melancholy conclusion that, instead of diminishing the number of wars, ecclesiastical influence has actually and very seriously increased it.”—ii. 254.

I observe the use of the word “ecclesiastical,” which was no doubt intentional, indicating in the author’s mind a distinction between the action and influence of the clergy and the Christian Religion which the clergy both represented and misunderstood. The distinction is neither superfluous, nor unfair; yet I think it may easily be pushed too far. The clergy are most justly regarded as standing with the mass of Christians, expressing their points of view, and rarely rising above or falling below their levels of conduct. The extent and elaboration of the

ecclesiastical machine have operated in times of transition as a barrier against change, so that in epochs of crisis the clergy are apt to fall behind the rest of Christians, and even to oppose resistance to salutary departures from precedent, but normally the clergy are affected by the circumstances of history much in the same measure as the rest of Christians.

I do not think Lecky's words would be untrue if we were to substitute "Christian" for "ecclesiastical," save that I am not quite sure whether the word "melancholy" ought not to be omitted. Would it be excessive to say that, "in looking back with our present experience, we are driven to the conclusion that, instead of diminishing the number of wars, Christian influence has actually, and very seriously, increased it?" To say this does not, to my thinking, either reflect discredit on the Christian Religion; or imply a confession of its failure as a redeeming power in human society; or even compel an abandonment of the belief that it is destined finally to establish the Reign of Peace on earth.

In saying this I do not wish to deny that ecclesiastical action and influence have very frequently been opposed to the principles of the Gospel, nor can I dispute the justice of the accusation that lays to the charge of the Christian Church a vast mass of unnecessary and profitless fighting. Lecky's language seems to me exaggerated, but broadly true, when he affirms that, "with the exception of Mohammedanism, no other religion has done so much to produce war as was done by the religious teachers of Christendom during several centuries."

Lecky, in common with many critics of Christianity, draws a deep distinction between the primitive Church with its "almost Quaker tenets," and the Church of later times with its sanguinary history of religious wars and persecutions. He dwells on the morally debasing effect of the contact with the uncivilized Teutonic races, and on the acute secularizing of the medieval Papacy. Mohammedanism, he suggests, in yielding to the superior power of Christendom, revenged itself by inoculating Christianity with the virus of militarism :—

"The spirit of Mohammedanism slowly passed into Christianity, and transformed it into its image. The spectacle of an essentially military religion fascinated men who were at once very warlike and very superstitious

"It would be impossible to conceive a more complete transformation than Christianity had thus undergone, and it is melancholy to contrast with its aspect during the crusades the impression it had once most justly made upon the world, as the spirit of gentleness and of peace encountering the spirit of violence and war."

Surely the roots of that transformation lay farther back than Lecky supposed, and the transformation itself had a more truly normal character than he believed. The primitive Church lay long under the great illusion of the Ascetics, and strove to conform its practice to an impossible conception of its position in the World. So long as Christians looked upon the world as their enemy, which they were bound to hold at arm's length, to repudiate, and if necessary, to resist, they had no concern with its politics, and took no part in its wars. They awaited the hour of its destruction, and were only anxious to be wholly free from a share in its fate. The extreme disgust with which the Romans regarded the early Christians arose from this anti-social indifference to mundane interests. Christians were on their own confession bad citizens, refusing to bear any part of the common burden, and bringing to the State only the unwholesome example of their pusillanimous behaviour, and the weakness of their futile creed.

"Indeed," writes Westernmarch, "in the whole Roman Empire there were no men who so entirely lacked patriotism as the early Christians. They had no affection for Judaea, they soon forgot Galilee, they cared nothing for the glory of Greece and Rome. When the Judges asked them which was their country they said in answer, 'I am a Christian.' And long after Christianity had become the religion of the Empire, St. Augustine declared that it matters not, in respect of this short and transitory life, under whose dominion a mortal man lives, if only he be not compelled to acts of impiety or injustice. Later on, when the Church grew into a political power independent of the State, she became a positive enemy of national interests. In the seventeenth century a Jesuit general called patriotism 'a plague and the most certain death of Christian love.'"*

Yet it is the case that nowhere has patriotism reached such strength and nobility as within Christendom, and this fact

* *v. Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, Vol. II. p. 179.

cannot be explained on any other supposition than that of a deep congruity between the essential principles of the Gospel and that sentiment of love of country which certainly belongs to the completeness of human nature. From the first, indeed, there were sane and clear-minded thinkers among Christians who aimed at effecting a *modus vivendi* with the world, in which it was necessary to live, and which it was possible to serve. St. Paul's writings contained the materials from which a more reasonable conception of Christian obligations might be framed. Every addition to the number of the disciples increased the difficulty of maintaining the ascetic attitude towards the world; and, when the long duel between the Church and Empire ended in the conversion of Constantine, the process which had been long gathering strength within the Church triumphed, and Christianity took its place avowedly as a world-force. The change of mind with respect to war was but one part of the grand revolution which was thereby compelled. The older ascetical notions withdrew to the Cloister, and there continued to hold sway within an ever-narrowing sphere. For good and for ill Christianity passed into the main stream of the world's life. Henceforth its influence would be less distinctive and more diffused. Christ would be thought of less as the Saviour of a little flock of the elect, rescued from a rebellious and perishing world, than as the rightful King of human life, Whose beneficent Empire was to be established by His followers over the whole area of society.

Christianity as a social force cannot operate in isolation from other social forces, or unlike them escape the dominion of historic circumstance. It becomes an integral part of the mingled stream of traditions and tendencies which we include in the term civilization, the highest part we must needs think, a waxing factor in the sum of social forces we may dare to hope, but still inexorably merged in the general stream, and never to be rightly judged apart from it.

Moreover, in becoming frankly secularized, Christianity had to contemplate situations which the direct teachings of the

Founder and His Apostles did not properly cover, and Christians were compelled to supplement their practical Directory from prae-Christian and non-Christian sources. The importance of the Old Testament here becomes apparent. There was a national literature, expressing the varied experiences of a Nation, and providing the materials from which a code of political morality might be constructed.

The Old Testament, of course, did not stand alone. There was the great tradition of Roman Government, and the treasury of many-sided wisdom which the literature of the Greeks provided. There was the steadily waxing accumulation of precedents, which went to the framing of the Canon Law, and the casuistic theories, which more or less governed the procedure of Christendom. But, while the Old Testament was thus supplemented from many sides, its influence remained in many directions paramount; and that influence was eminently favourable to the theory and practice of War. The Jewish Nation, whose experiences thus became the principal guide of European thinking for many centuries, was a relatively backward nation, and the pages of the Jewish national literature were filled with records of violence which were ill fitted to promote the humaner sentiments in the minds of Christian students. It is related of the famous Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths, that when he made a translation of the Scriptures for the use of his converts, he omitted all the Book of Kings. "because they are a mere narrative of military exploits, and the Gothic tribes were especially fond of war, and were in more need of restraints to check their military passions than of spurs to urge them on to deeds of war."

It had perhaps been well for Christendom if a like caution had governed the procedure of other Christian teachers, especially of those who wielded the immense powers of the Roman See, during those centuries when the nations of Europe sought from Rome the moral guidance which they needed. The Reformation, itself in a large measure a national movement, gave special authority to the Old Testament, and thus

strengthened the place of war in the scheme of Christian morality. Besides, not only did Christianity stimulate and strengthen those vigorous qualities which make for self-respect, and thereby add force to certain factors of human life which cannot be said to make for peace, but it did add to the normal causes of conflict others of a different kind, connected with its own claims. Consider the full significance of the Christian doctrine of the individual conscience. Apart from the Jewish wars against Antiochus Epiphanes, is there any real parallel to the Wars of Religion, which have from time to time devastated Christendom? Christianity, of course, stands in filial relation to Judaism, and therefore this exception is more apparent than real. I do not say that there have not been religious wars outside the Christian sphere, but that those religious wars which have broken out within that sphere have had a special character owing to the solemn emphasis which Christianity places on the individual conscience. This emphasis is the greatest service which Christianity has rendered to humanity, but the relentless character which it contributed to religious conflicts in the prae-Toleration epoch has stamped on the page of history some of its blackest chapters.

Similarly, Christianity has stimulated the sentiments which underlie what is now called Democracy, and thus it has strengthened, and in a sense consecrated, the natural grace of Patriotism, for Patriotism, as was said by Montesquieu, thrives best in democracies. As if to make amends for its faulty citizenship in the ancient world, Christianity has elevated Patriotism to a religious obligation in the modern. The whole conception of Rights as belonging to Men, and to Nations, is saturated with Christianity. Add to the wars of Religion the wars of Nationality, and you have made a substantial addition to the evidence which can be offered to sustain the charge that Christianity has been warlike in tendency. We may admit the justice of that charge so far as certain phases of Christian history are concerned. The first effect of the stimulus given to Patriotism is to multiply wars; but that is not the last and

enduring effect. For Christianity exalts as well as stimulates, purges as well as inspires, the natural sentiments. Patriotism becomes an ever more discerning and righteous sentiment as it enters into the scheme of Christian duty. It corrects and disallows that brazen and tyrannous Imperialism which is the rank growth of patriotism divorced from morality. Thus it will follow that the higher the notion of Patriotism current in men's minds, and the wider the extent of that notion in the world, the less risk of war there will be; and therefore Christianity as the Religion of true Patriotism will ultimately prove to be peaceful.

We must never forget that Christian Morality is progressive, that is to say, it is continually moving beyond its own precedents. Christianity sanctions in one age what it condemns in another, and outgrows limits which it has contentedly accepted. It is an error to base on this instability an accusation against the Christian Church, as if Christian History were nothing but one long treason against a Divine Commandment. If it be the case, as of course Christians must needs believe, that the principles of right human action were once for all declared in the Gospel, and perfectly embodied in the Life of Jesus Christ, yet it is not less the case that the right application of those principles to the ever-changing circumstances of human society were not, and could not, be indicated in advance of the experiences which required them. Some words of Dr. Hort state the case very suggestively:—

“The Apostolic Age is full of embodiments of purposes and principles of the most instructive kind; but the responsibility of choosing the means was left for ever to the Ecclesia itself and to each Ecclesia, guided by ancient precedent on the one hand and adaptation to present and future needs on the other. The Lesson-Book of the Ecclesia, and of every Ecclesia, is not a Law but a History.”

Accordingly, we should expect to find that there would be no fixity of Christian attitude towards War, but rather a gradual clearing away of hesitation and doubt, and a gradual emergence of some clear view of Christian obligation. So much, I think, the history of Christianity discloses.

Individual protests against War in the past have commonly been based on mistaken views as to the method of Christianity. They have mostly proceeded from individuals of narrow outlook and experience like George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, or have been parts of sectarian perversions of Christianity such as that which St. Augustine condemns as distinctive of the Manichaeans. They have a certain importance as disclosing a restlessness of the Christian conscience, and they may be regarded as prophetic of a time, when the Christian Society will have led mankind up to a point at which war becomes anomalous and difficult to justify. That point once reached, the day could not be far distant when war would fall out of recognised usage of Christian nations, and become as obsolete within the sphere of civilization as Slavery.

It does not seem to me excessive to say that the world has come perceptibly near to the point of discarding war as inconsistent with civilized principles. The belief that war is not necessarily indispensable has rooted itself in the popular mind, and will certainly bear fruit. It is undoubtedly the case that the excessive optimism which inspired the agitation for reduction of armaments in this country, and led a considerable number of Christian teachers, mostly among the Nonconformists, to preach a kind of international Quakerism, has been roughly corrected by the outbreak of the gigantic conflict which is now proceeding. The progress of ideas has not been uniform throughout Christendom, and so long as considerable sections of civilized humanity cherish barbarous notions with respect to war, so long the triumph of peace must necessarily be postponed. War will retain the character of a moral instrument so long as there are militarist oligarchies ruling nations; and so long as this can be said of war, Christianity will sanction its use. This, indeed, is the great contribution which Christianity has made, and is making, towards the abolition of war—it conditions its sanction of war by the competence of war to justify itself as a moral instrument. So long as Edmund Burke's declaration, that "War is the sole

means of justice amongst nations," continues to be true, so long Christians will find themselves under the dolorous obligation of waging war. Not to do so would immerse them in the guilt of condoning wickedness, and stultify their claim to represent in the world the Kingdom of Righteousness. But, once make a conscience of fighting, and you are on the way to end it; for conscience, just in measure as it is trained in the school of Christ, and kept efficient by exercise, is severely critical of the occasions of war, and disallows all that are not plainly adequate. Accordingly, we are witnessing a marked change for the better in the views which civilized men adopt as to the quality of provocation which may rightly form a *casus belli*. More and more it is coming to be admitted that most of the wars of history were waged for inadequate causes. Dynastic wars could not pass muster with the civilized conscience of to-day. Religious wars have been finally condemned as plainly violating the principle of Religious Toleration. Commercial wars *eo nomine* are no longer defended, and are waged only under false pretences of being something more respectable. Wars of sheer aggression are plainly abhorrent to the general conscience. Wars in the alleged interest of imperial expansion are now in debate, and it does not seem doubtful that the final verdict will disallow them. The vast conflict, which is now wasting the world, belongs to this category, and, when it is concluded after an expenditure of blood and treasure which will oppress and dislocate civilized society for many years, we may venture to hope that another moral advance will be registered in the archives of mankind, and the Reign of Peace on earth brought appreciably nearer.

I confess that the really anxious matter to my thinking arises from the insecurity of Christianity as a governing factor within Christendom. This is the dolourous question which the spectacle of modern Germany proposes in a most threatening shape. The present war, so shameless in its outbreak, so shameful in its conduct, has thrown a flood of light on the

process by which the German people has been hoodwinked and seduced into what can only be called a deliberate repudiation of the Christian point of view. It is the saddest and most menacing spectacle that can be conceived. A great nation having its whole mind deliberately concentrated on war, its imagination fired by war, its conscience bemused and degraded by the sophistries of war, its energies poured forth in the practice of war, and all this in an age which is plainly outgrowing both the theory and the habit of war, and in circumstances which seem to call with insistence and persistence for the maintenance of peace.

"In regard to Germany," writes Professor Cramb in his remarkably suggestive little book of *Lectures on Germany and England*, "we are confronted by certain circumstances that indisputably merit our consideration here in England. There is, for instance, the annual appearance in Germany of very nearly seven hundred books dealing with war as a science. This points at once to an extreme pre-occupation in that nation with the idea of war. I doubt whether twenty books a year on the art of war appear in this country, and whether their circulation, when they do appear, is much more than twenty!

"There is, again, the German way of regarding war. What is the attitude of mind towards war of Treitschke, for example, a man whose spirit still controls German youth, German patriotism, a man who has a power in Germany as a thinker and as a writer, that you might compare to the power exercised by Carlyle and by Macaulay put together in this country. To him the army is simply the natural expression of the vital forces of the nation, and just as these vital forces of the nation increase so shall the German army and the German navy increase. A nation's military efficiency is the exact co-efficient of a nation's idealism. That is Treitschke's solution of the matter. His answer to all our talk about the limitation of armaments is: Germany shall increase to the utmost of her power, irrespective of any proposals made to her by England or by Russia, or by any other State upon this earth. . . . The teaching of Treitschke's disciple, General Von Bernhardi, is the same. War to him is a duty. Nothing is more terrible than the government of the strong by the weak, and war is the power by which the strong assert their dominion over the weak. War sets the balance right. And the younger poets of Germany breathe the same spirit (p. 64, 5).

This doctrine about war proceeds on principles which are totally inconsistent with Christianity, and it can only command the acceptance of the German people as an alternative to Christianity. It inspires and nourishes the spirit of hatred, the precise contradiction of the Christian spirit of love.

This cult of war has gone hand in hand with a striking abandonment of Christianity in large sections of the people. In a recent issue of the *Hibbert Journal*, a well informed writer discusses the religious situation in Germany. It would appear that religious observance is practically extinct in Berlin.

"The nominally Protestant population of Berlin is 2,060,000. Last February, on a Sunday when numerous confirmations were to take place, there was a total attendance at the various Protestant churches of 35,000."

Attendance at Church is no safe indication of religion, yet it is difficult to imagine an almost total cessation of Church attendance going along with any vital faith in Christianity. It is the more sadly suggestive when we remember that religion has a large place in the scheme of Prussian Government; we cannot ascribe the decay of Christianity to the influence of secular schools.

"Religion has never been neglected in Prussia. In the schools it has always been assiduously instilled into the child-mind. Neither dissenters nor free-thinkers are allowed to withdraw their children from this religious instruction, and many influential journals are now making a vigorous demand for similar compulsory instruction in the continuation schools. No one who openly opposed the Christian religion would have any chance of obtaining a position in the Civil Service; no one already in the Service would look for promotion if he formally left the Church. Organised irreligion has contributed little to bring about the present situation. Until quite recently the number of avowed anti-Christians disclosed by official returns has been small—so small as to evoke the sneers of those whose religious enthusiasm exceeds their discretion."—*Hibbert Journal*, July, 1914.

The behaviour of the religious leaders of Germany during the present war, has been extremely bewildering. Much must, of course, be allowed on the score of patriotic prejudice, much also on that of sheer ignorance of the facts; but even then, enough is left to raise in the mind an uncomfortable suspicion that even professed Christianity in Germany has lost hold of those essential moralities of the Gospel, apart from which Christianity becomes as "Salt that has lost its savour." We are not the Judges of other men; to their own Master they stand or fall; there is enough to humiliate and alarm us in our own country and in our own Church. Nevertheless, I must

needs think it permissible and considerable to point out the suggestive combination of the German Cult of War and the German Neglect of Religious Observance. Germany is not the only country in which the repudiation of the Christian point of view can be perceived. The recent history of France has pointed in the same direction; and, though at the moment there is much confident talk of a religious revival in that country, it is hard to determine how much truth is to be disentangled from what is unquestionably a large mass of interested exaggeration. The prospect of the final abolition of war turns on the triumph of Christian principles in modern society. If those principles be abandoned, I can see no escape from a profound pessimism. A Christian community can only change for the worse, if it changes at all, in the matter of social principles.

The rapid spread of Socialism is thought by many to tell in the direction of universal peace. In so far as Socialism itself expresses certain Christian principles, its influence will assuredly be pacific. But it is not yet clear what direction will be given to the Socialist movement. For the most part it is avowedly hostile to Christianity, but it is legitimate to think that much of this hostility is the result of a profound misunderstanding, and an infinity of practical blunders. Be this as it may, it does not affect our present discussion because Socialism can only be pacific, by being Christian. Apart from Christian principles it might become the inspiration of the most disastrous form of war—class war.

Lecky admits that however great may have been the failure of Christianity in relation to war itself, there can be no doubt that it has exercised a beneficial influence on the conduct of war. "But although theological influences cannot reasonably be said to have diminished the number of wars, they have had a very real and beneficial effect in diminishing their atrocity."

It may be pointed out that the repudiation of the Christian point of view has been significantly followed by a return to those barbarities which marked pre-Christian warfare. I think it will be universally admitted that the Christian religion

makes for mercy and humaneness. The "Red Cross" is the accepted symbol of healing compassion, moving between the hostile hosts, giving its blessed ministries to both, raising on the battle-field, amid the monstrous effects of human cruelty, the protest of mercy, and consecrating the scenes of death by the sign of victorious and immortal life. Christianity, in drawing into play and adding strength and dignity to the gentler sentiments of humanity, has indirectly weakened those contrary sentiments which make for war. Enthusiasm and admiration are being silently transferred from the heroism of battle to the quieter, yet not less impressive, heroism of service; and the manly sense of civilised mankind is itself being enlisted on the side of peace. The process of civilization co-operates powerfully with Christian effort in bringing into play the humaner forces.

In former ages communications were slow and difficult; a heavy cloak of obscurity fell over the happenings of every campaign; and the full horrors of the warfare were mostly unrealized. But with the spread of education, and the equipment of society with the manifold resources of modern civilization, all this has been changed. Men realize as never before the extent and nature of the tragedies in which they are plunged by the outbreak of war, and thus a great and ever greater repugnance is bred in their minds. It is notorious that the general sentiment of democracy is extremely hostile to war, and becoming ever more hostile, so that it becomes questionable whether any civilized Government will in the future be able to persuade its own citizens to embark on an enterprise so repulsive. It may well be the case—God grant that it may—that the hideous slaughter and suffering of the monstrous war which now convulses the world will make an impression on the popular mind so deep and terrible, that a blessed revolution in international relations will result, and war vanish from the usage of the Peoples by a spontaneous and impassioned consent. That happy event, whenever it comes, will be justly described as the effect of Christianity.

FACT AND INTERPRETATION.

By the Rev. H. C. TOWNSEND, B.D.

"One should not always ask : What's this or that? but sometimes, What's its import?"—Hebbel: *Gyges and His Ring*.

Facts remain constant. They are capable of statement only. They cannot be re-stated. On the other hand, they have always been, are now, and ever will be, capable of re-interpretation. The difficulty we have to face, in certain cases, is that of distinguishing between fact and interpretation, or perhaps we should say in arriving at the basal fact which really underlies a particular or even various interpretations. Making every reasonable allowance for the "subjective element," it should not be impossible to reach what we will term a minimum of fact in any concrete case.

In considering the foundation of Christianity which we take to be the fact of Christ Himself and certain definite undeveloped historical statements (not interpretations) made about Him, it would seem reasonable to select what are generally admitted to be the earliest documents available, viz., Paul's Epistles and Mark's Gospel. There is, of course, by the nature of the case, considerably more interpretation by the former, and though it is important to remember that they preceded Mark, yet the interval between them was probably less than that which separated Mark from any other of our present gospels.

A brief quotation from Prof. Burkitt's *Gospel History and its Transmission* is so extremely apposite that we make no apology for giving it here:—

The other Gospels, even the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke, give us an interpretation of Jesus Christ's life. An interpretation may be helpful, illuminating, even inspired, but it remains an interpretation. The thing that actually occurred was the life which Jesus Christ lived, and our chief authority for the facts of that life is the Gospel according to Mark. We must be prepared resolutely to hold

fast by the result we have attained. Ideas may develop, interpretations may become more noble and more profound, but the facts of ancient history do not develop. They remain the same. We must resist the temptation to try and fit into the historical framework supplied by Mark all the tales and sayings of Christ that we find in the other Gospels. We must beware of regarding as additions to the sacred Biography things that are in reality interpretations of it."

It is, indeed, almost an axiom of modern criticism that in Mark we certainly come nearer to the historic Jesus than anywhere. Let us accept that. The writer of the Second Gospel nowhere asserts, like the writer of the Fourth Gospel, that "these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life through His Name."

What, then, are the basal facts to be gathered from the Second Gospel?

Jesus is living—a man amongst men. He teaches. He heals. He chooses disciples. He suffers. He is crucified. He dies. He is buried. The grave in which His Body had been laid is found to be empty.

Perhaps we may venture to add to these, whilst still keeping to our minimum, He institutes the Last Supper. He attributes an atoning value to His death. He claims to be the Messiah.

These are bare facts derived from Mark. Most of these are stated by Paul as facts, though, as we have already said, some interpretation of them is given. We must add to our list, from Paul: the fact of the Resurrection, and certain appearances of Jesus after His Death recorded in 1 Cor. xv. 4-8, as bare fact with no explanation whatever.

Now we are entitled to ask, what room is there for any subjective element, large or small, in this list of basal facts we have been able to acquire from Mark and Paul?

Again, is there really any single one of the facts in our list that cannot be accepted by all Christians? Is not this the foundation other than which no man can lay, "Jesus Christ and Him crucified?" A foundation so strong—so wide—that not one, but many goodly buildings may be erected and stand

harmoniously side by side upon it. It is not the foundation which requires relaying, but some of the débris with which men have covered it, that needs removal.

Further, may we not say that the fact of the Incarnation is in Mark, as it certainly is in Paul? It is true that Mark offers no particular interpretation of it. We do not include what is called the Virgin Birth in our list, for although considered in itself it must be a fact or a non-fact, *i.e.*, Jesus was born of a Virgin *or* He was not, yet it seems only fair to recognise that, *in its context*, it *may* be classed under the head of interpretation. This, at least, we may say, that it seemed to the Church the best interpretation of the Incarnation (there were others), and there can be little doubt that it was the best at the time and for long after. It made things easy. It explained in a more or less adequate manner, which we take to be the proper function of interpretation. It seems, perhaps, *not* the best to-day. It does not explain in an adequate manner. On the contrary, it embarrasses the Fact of which it is an interpretation, which, since the fact itself is accepted (by those for whom we write) cannot be satisfactory, and in itself suggests that some other interpretation is required.

The same holds good with respect to the Resurrection of the body. The Fact here embraces and includes its proof—the appearance of Jesus again after His death—in no other manner could the fact itself exist for us, *i.e.*, to material beings in a material sphere and under material conditions the fact *is* the appearance. It may also include, as many believe, the Empty Tomb, though it is only right to recognise that this may, *in the context*, be an interpretation of the Resurrection, just as we have seen the Virgin Birth may be of the Incarnation. It is, however, important to remember that in Mark “the fact” is the Empty Tomb. It would also seem to be primary to those who are able to believe that the knowledge of its being found empty preceded any appearance of Jesus, in accordance with the order of all the narratives except, perhaps, Paul. It may certainly be held that Paul’s reference to the third day (a puzzle not yet

solved to the satisfaction of modern criticism) and his statement, for it is a statement, though it takes the form of a quotation, that the Body of Jesus did not see corruption, are sufficient evidence for his acceptance of the fact of the Empty Tomb.

The Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb, though it is only just to say that the evidence for the latter is stronger, are just two particular cases in which the difficulty of deciding between fact and interpretation is extremely great. Let us frankly admit that there are arguments both ways. To insist arbitrarily upon the acceptance of these two as facts is to alienate and lose the sympathy and support of many for whom Christ died. To allow that they *may be* interpretations of the facts of the Incarnation and the Resurrection cannot, or at least, ought not to alienate anyone who accepts these two essential and primary verities.

Questions as to the nature of our Lord's risen Body, and still more, as to the nature of our future state—that our natural bodies shall rise—are Interpretation, not Fact. The interpretations popularly accepted instead of explaining the fact, which is Resurrection, and making it easy, on the contrary embarrass it, confuse it, make it more difficult of belief.

In the celebrated passage, 1 Cor., xv., 4-8, "the fact of Appearance" alone is barely recorded—no explanation is offered, no subjective element appears. The same may, we think, be fairly said of the Atonement and the Institution of the Eucharist, in Mark. Whatever our Lord meant, He refused to explain, on more than one occasion, when it would have seemed to us only judicious to do so. In handling essential verities—eternal truths—facts—He does not explain, He states them. It is for us, as indeed it was for His disciples, to interpret according to the measure that is given us.¹ It is sometimes

¹ A mere sequence of facts without interpretation would be of little use to us. There is a point of view from which Interpretation looms larger than Fact, and it may be said that it is sometimes more important to know what was believed to have happened than what actually did happen.

Supposing it be allowed that Christ's Ascension into Heaven, His descent into Hell, His Session at the right hand of God, His Second Coming, even His miraculous birth are Interpretation, yet there is what we may call a Fact-value behind them which preserves, and will preserve, the religious value of the Truth they are intended to explain.

asked, "Have we any right to re-interpret—to reconstruct?" It is the highest privilege left by Christ to His followers. The inspiration of the Church is interpretative. The Holy Spirit guides gradually from less to more into all Truth. It is the differentiation between a living faith and a dead theology. The Catholic Church has, as a matter of fact, always recognised this right, always exercised it. What are the Creeds but an interpretation of the facts about Jesus? What are the Sacraments but an interpretation of the fact of communion with Him? What is the elaboration of ceremonial worship but an interpretation of the desire to honour His Holy Name and His Word? The action of the Holy Spirit has ever been a progressive witness to Him during the centuries which have passed since His bodily presence was withdrawn.

The *Hibbert Journal* for July, 1914, published an article in which the Rev. J. M. Thompson contrasts Modernism with what he terms Post-Modernism. The following short extract is clear, concise, and illuminative.

The essence of Modernism is its feeling for the Catholic tradition, its conviction that reconstruction (which it never doubts is necessary) must somehow begin on the original foundations, and use up what is valuable in the old materials.

But, however faithful he may be to tradition, the Post-Modernist has no illusions as to its real nature. He does not deceive himself into thinking that all he has to do is to re-interpret and re-express an unchanging faith. He believes that the faith has changed, and is changing, far more than one would judge from the rigidity of its formulae.

The description of Modernism given here is not one with which we have any need to quarrel. In this sense most of us are and are perfectly satisfied to be called Modernists, and it is along these lines alone that we believe Re-interpretation and Re-construction to be possible.

We are not prepared to allow that the Christian Faith has changed. We cannot believe that the essential "Facts" to which we have drawn attention have changed or ever can change, though our understanding of them may develop and our explanation of them continually need re-statement. The Post

Modernist would appear (from the quotation), by a curious paradox, to be seeking to replace our essential facts by some modern Interpretation of them. This is surely an illusion.

In the same issue of the *Hibbert Journal* the Dean of St. Paul's lays it down that:—

The primary evidence for the truth of religion is religious experience.

Dr. Inge is before all else a philosopher, and this statement of his may or may not be true of religion in the abstract, but it is certainly not true of an historical religion such as Christianity. The primary evidence for Christianity is to be found in its fundamental historical facts and not in the ever-changing and usually nebulous experience of either individuals or communities. What Dr. Inge really states is the position of the Mystic as against the Institutional—though indeed the religious experience of both these rests upon admitted primary facts.

It is, of course, obvious that interpretation follows experience. Certainly Jesus had to live before any attempt at explanation, *i.e.*, any interpretation could be made of His actions or words. He had to be experienced. Just in the same way He had to manifest Himself after the crucifixion before any interpretation of the Resurrection was possible. Facts must come first.

An excellent working order is given in the *Expository Times* for August, 1914:—

First, the experience of Christ and His immediate teachings.

Secondly, the numerous interpretations of the significance of Christ's experience and teachings.

Thirdly, the embodiment of these doctrines in the life of the religious community.

Fourthly, the primary religious experience of the individual responding to his religious environment.

Fifthly, the individual's own interpretation of his religious experience in the light of all that he knows.

The Dean of St. Paul's apparently reverses the order. May we not venture to hope that acceptance of a minimum list of basal facts such as have been here suggested, with full liberty of interpretation, would lead, not merely to an increase of faith and devotion amongst many who are now passing through a period of spiritual stress and unrest, but would seem to point

the way to a possible reunion amongst those who have been separated, not in the main on any question of fact, but through inability to accept particular interpretations.¹

It is clear then that it is our duty to study more carefully the relation between Fact and Interpretation; to try to understand and allow for the subjective factor, the environment, the influences, which led to the preference for any one interpretation over other; to consider whether such a survival has not really been a "survival of the fittest;" to condemn no man whose belief in the basal facts is as strong as our own, because his explanation of them happens, very often for purely accidental reasons, to be somewhat different from the explanation we ourselves have been wont to accept or are now prepared to give.

JOHN HUS.

By Rev. J. W. HUNKIN, M.A., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College,
Cambridge.

The last hundred years have seen a renewal in Bohemia of the ancient struggle between the native Bohemians (Czechs) and the Germans (Austrians) who have for centuries been established among them. The Czechs form about 65 per cent. and the Germans the remaining 35 per cent. of the total population, but the political power is in the hands of the Germans, and the Czechs suffer under serious disabilities. The German language, for instance, is still the official language of the country. An attempt was made in 1897 to secure equal rights for the Bohemian language, but it failed.

¹ It is not suggested that these are all the facts we can reach in the records of Christianity. They are simply offered, as has been said, as a minimum. The present writer would even call them an irreducible minimum. It is felt that they should be acceptable to all.

The present war has placed the Czechs in a peculiarly distressing position, in which they have the deep sympathy of the English people. If it had not been for the war we should have joined the University of Prague in celebrating this year the Quincentenary of its most famous Rector, John Hus.

It was about the year 1389 that John entered the University, and was inscribed in its books as John of Husinecz, his native village. The University was at that time only just over forty years old, but it had already attracted students from all parts of Europe. They were divided into "nations," the Bohemian "nation," the Bavarian "nation," and so on; and not only the undergraduates but the M.A.'s also were divided in this way. All lectures were delivered in Latin.

By 1396 John Hus, as he soon came to be called, was an M.A., and two years later he began to lecture. In 1402 he was Rector of the University for six months, and in the same year he was appointed curate of the Bethlehem chapel, which had been founded about ten years previously for preaching in the national language. It was a large building capable of containing over a thousand people, and it soon became the centre of the remarkable influence which up to the end of his life John Hus continued to exercise over the burghers of Prague.

In 1405 Sbynko, the Archbishop of Prague, sent Hus with two other priests to inquire into certain strange miracles which were reported from the village of Wilsnack, near Wittenberg. Three bleeding holy wafers, said to have been found there, were attracting a large number of pilgrims.

The results of the investigation were deplorable, and Hus wrote a little book, *De Omni Sanguine Christi Glorificato*, in which he protested in the strongest terms against the deceitfulness and greed of the clergy, and urged Christians to seek Christ, not in forged miracles, but in his enduring word.

This was the beginning of the career of Hus as a reformer. As preacher in the Bethlehem chapel he continued to expose

the various corruptions which were rife among the clergy, with the result that a complaint was sent to the Archbishop, of the scandalous sermons by which he had "lacerated the minds of the faithful, and rendered the clergy odious to the people." But if the state of the clergy in Bohemia was such as to rouse the indignation of John Hus and his friends, the state of the Papacy was deeply exercising the minds of all serious men throughout Europe. Since the beginning of the Papal schism in 1378, there had been two Popes fulminating and fighting against one another, and raising money by all sorts of doubtful means to carry on the struggle.

In 1408 the two rivals were Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. A scheme was now launched in Italy by which the schism might be ended. The partisans of both Popes were to pledge themselves to neutrality until a new Pope should be elected. This scheme was strongly supported by the Universities of Paris and Bologna, and King Wenceslas of Bohemia was persuaded to favour it also. The three German "nations" in the University of Prague, however, continued to support the claims of Gregory XII.; and to minimise the effect of their opposition King Wenceslas signed a decree (January 18th, 1409) by which the Bohemian "nation," which in this matter, led by Hus, was on the side of the King, received three votes instead of one in all University affairs. This only brought the University of Prague into line with the great University of Paris, where the French "nation" had three votes, while all other "nations" had only one; but the Germans were highly incensed. They addressed a strong protest to the King, and finally withdrew from Prague in a body, to the number of over a thousand, and proceeded to found a new University at Leipzig.

It was a triumph for the nationalists, and Hus was for the second time appointed Rector of the now depleted University. "Praise God," he is reported to have said in one of his sermons, "we have excluded the Germans." But if that saying of his is to be recorded it is only fair to set by the side of it another,—

"I love a good German better than a bad Bohemian, even if he be my own brother."

By this time Hus had many enemies. Archbishop Sbynko in particular was bitter against him. It was probably due to Sbynko's influence that the new Pope, Alexander V., issued a bull forbidding preaching in such places as the Bethlehem chapel, condemning certain articles of belief attributed to John Wycliffe, and ordering his books to be "removed from the eyes of the faithful."

Now, for many years, Hus had been an admirer of the writings of Wycliffe. He had studied them and lectured upon them. Some of them he had translated, and some he had copied out with his own hand.

He was not unaware that some of Wycliffe's teaching was capable of a dangerous interpretation, but he knew perfectly well that the forty-five articles which had been associated with the name of the English divine gave a false and distorted account of his opinions. One of them, the sixth, actually charged Wycliffe with maintaining that *Deus debet obedire diabolo*, God ought to obey the devil!

In this matter Hus had the support of at any rate a large section of his University. Copies of certain of Wycliffe's works were sent to the Archbishop with the message: "When you have found any errors in them be pleased to point them out to us and we shall be glad to denounce them publicly." But Sbynko was not to be prevented. He had 200 manuscripts of Wycliffe's writings solemnly burned in the courtyard of his palace. The feeling in Prague was intense. Satirical rhymes were sung in the streets:—

"Sbynko, Bishop, A B C,
Burnt the books; but ne'er knew he
What in them was written."

Hus had been denounced as a disobedient son of the Church, but he appealed to John XXIII., who had now succeeded Alexander V. as Pope, and boldly continued to preach in the Bethlehem chapel. The King himself wrote a letter to the

Pope in his support. Queen Sophia wrote not only to the Pope but also to the Cardinals, and declared that the Bethlehem chapel was "most useful to us and to the inhabitants of our kingdom for hearing the word of God." Nobles and burghers joined in pleading for their preacher, but in vain. Hus, however, went on with his work. He preached to enormous congregations, and not only preached but taught them to sing hymns in their native language, hymns which he translated for them out of the Latin.

About this time he was greatly cheered by receiving a letter from an Englishman. It was from a Lollard, Richard Wiche, who wrote to encourage "his most dearly beloved brother in Christ, although in face unknown, yet not in faith or love."

Hus read it out to a large assembly of people numbering, he thought, nearly 10,000. "Our dear brother, Richard," he said, "partner of Master John Wycliffe in the toils of the gospel, hath written you a letter of so much cheer, that, if I possessed no other writing, I should feel bound by it to offer myself for the gospel of Christ even unto death."

Hus sent his English friend a most grateful reply, in the course of which he said, "I must tell you, dear brother, that the people will listen to nothing but the Holy Scriptures, especially the gospel and the epistles. Wherever in city or town, in village or castle, the preacher of the holy truth makes his appearance, the people flock together in crowds, despising the clergy who are not able to furnish it. As a result Satan hath arisen: for now the tail of Behemoth himself hath been set in motion, and it remains for the Lord Jesus Christ to bruise his head. See, I have but gently touched his tail, and he hath opened wide his mouth to swallow me down and my brothers also."

Pope John was an ex-soldier of bad reputation, and his chief aim seems to have been to carve out for himself a Kingdom in Italy. He therefore proclaimed a crusade against King Ladislas of Naples, his chief opponent, and offered indulgences to all who would take part in it whether personally or by means of a contribution of money. Now,

though in theory indulgences promised forgiveness of sins only to those who were truly penitent, in the hands of an unscrupulous clergy they became in practice little more than pardons for sin which could be procured simply by payment.

In the large hall of the University Hus delivered a disputation against these indulgences, and thereby lost the support of the theological faculty of the University, including Stephen Paletz, "the friend of his youth," who "slid back like a crab," as Hus said. The people, however, stood by their leader, and the more violent organised demonstrations which degenerated into riots. In July (1412) Hus was excommunicated by the Pope, and places which gave him shelter were laid under an interdict. By the King's wish Hus withdrew from Prague, and spent the next two years in preaching tours and in writing his book *De Ecclesia*, in composing which he made a very full use of the works of Wycliffe.

Meanwhile, preparations were being made for a General Council to be held at Constance, the main object of which was the reform of the Church, and the healing of its schisms.

Sigismund the Emperor, a brother of King Wenceslas, summoned Hus to appear before the Council. Hus willingly agreed to come, and begged to be given an opportunity in the Council itself to make a public profession of his faith. On his way to Constance he wrote to his friends:—"I have started on my journey without safe conduct into the midst of many of my greatest enemies, among whom the most relentless are those of my own household."

His way led through Southern Germany, and he was delighted with his reception by Germans. "I have not met a single enemy as yet," he wrote from Nuremberg. "In every inn I leave the host as a parting gift a copy of the Ten Commandments. . . . All the hostesses and their husbands give me a right hearty welcome. Nowhere do they put into force the edict of excommunication."

On his arrival at Constance he received a "safe conduct" from the Emperor, which promised that whatever judgment

might be passed on him, he should be allowed to return in safety to Bohemia, where, if he was to be punished, he would be punished by his own King, Wenceslas.

It is not necessary here to go into details concerning the Council of Constance. Hus was kept waiting till June 5th, 1415, when his case at last came up for hearing. In the meantime the unanimous condemnation of the 45 articles attributed to John Wycliffe (May 4) may have shown him what to expect.

Propositions extracted from his various works, and particularly from his book, *De Ecclesia*, were made the ground of the accusation of heresy against him. When he began to make his defence he was interrupted by loud cries, and finally had to desist.

The sitting was adjourned till June 7th, and as on this occasion Sigismund was present in person the Council was more orderly. Hus was accused of having adopted the doctrinal position of Wycliffe. He replied that although he had a great admiration for the English Divine, that did not mean that he had abandoned the doctrine of the Church. Next day propositions from his book *De Ecclesia* were brought against him in detail. Some of them he defended, others he denied, and stated that they had been misquoted or misinterpreted. He refused to make any general recantation, for that would have been an admission of previous error which he could not honestly make.

Hus was now kept in prison for four weeks, and efforts were made to persuade him to submit. "I have been interviewed by many exhorters," he wrote to his Bohemian friends, "They have pleaded at great length that I ought to abjure and can do so lawfully by submitting my will to the Holy Church, which is represented by the Holy Council," and he ends the letter with the words "In His mercy Christ Jesus ever keeps me to my former resolve."

On July 6th sentence against him was pronounced. His attempt to remonstrate being in vain, he betook himself to

silent prayer. He was solemnly degraded from the priesthood, a tall paper cap with three devils on it was placed on his head, and his soul was committed to Satan. He was then handed over to the secular arm for execution.

The recognised punishment for heresy was that which had been decreed by the Emperor Frederick II.,—death at the stake. Sigismund's safe conduct was treacherously ignored, and Hus was led forth that very day to the place just outside the city where he was to suffer, a place now marked by a stone with an inscription.

As he passed through the cathedral yard he saw his books being burned. He smiled, and begged the crowd not to believe the lies that were told about him. When he reached the place of execution, he fell upon his knees, and, "with arms stretched out, and eyes uplifted to heaven," he repeated Psalm xxxi. :—

In Thee, O Lord, do I put my trust ;

Into Thy hands I commend my spirit :

Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of Truth.

And the bystanders noticed that he said the words *hilariter et vultu laeto*,¹ merrily and with a cheerful countenance. He was fastened to the stake, and faggots mixed with straw were piled up to his chin.

For the last time he was asked if he would recant and save his life. In a loud voice, looking up to heaven, he replied, "God is my witness that I have never taught or preached the things which false witnesses have ascribed to me, but the one purpose of my preaching, and of whatever I have done or written has been to draw men away from their sins. I have preached the Truth of the gospel as it has been taught by the Fathers of the Church, and in that Truth I now joyfully die."

The pile was lighted, and he began to sing "Christ, Son of the living God, have mercy upon us." Soon the wind blew the flames into his face. Then while "one might say the

¹ Peter of Mladenovicz, whose account is that of an eye witness (Palacky : Documenta).

Lord's Prayer twice or at the most three times," his lips moved in silent prayer, and he was dead.

It is, perhaps, chiefly as a patriot that Hus is being remembered by his fellow-countrymen this year.

About 96 per cent. of them are Roman Catholics, and to them Hus is primarily the man who resisted the pressure of the Germans in the early days of their University, who powerfully assisted the development of their native language, and undoubtedly did more than any other single man to awaken their consciousness as a nation.

But it is, above all, as reformer and martyr that Hus is remembered by the Protestant world. He is the link which connects Wycliffe with Luther. His own dependence on the English scholar is sometimes over-estimated. He was a man of wide reading and of great intellectual power, as is proved by his learned commentary on *The Sentences* of Peter Lombard, the great theological text-book of the middle ages. Nor must too much emphasis be laid upon his connexion with his predecessors in his own country, preachers like Conrad and Milicz, and writers like Matthias of Janow. The labours of these men did much to prepare the Bohemians to receive the message of Hus when it came; but it was, above all, his own observation of the state of religion around him that led him to give that message.

His mind was essentially a practical one. To correct abuses was his aim, rather than to advocate any new religious or ecclesiastical system. Many of the clergy were grasping and worldly, some were even dishonest and immoral. Therefore, said Hus, they are not true under-shepherds of Christ. The Pope, as everyone knew, was a scoundrel, and some whispered that he was an infidel as well. Therefore, said Hus, he cannot be the real Head of the Church on earth, and Christ could govern His people better without him than with him.

His mind turned from the corruptions of the institutional religion of his day to the conception of the "blessed company

of faithful people," whose real leaders, he said, were known only to God. His theological views, with the possible exception of his view of predestination (in which he professed to follow St. Augustine) were those of the Church. He was condemned not for them, but for his loyalty to Wycliffe, for his strictures upon the lives of the clergy, and for his repudiation of Papal claims.

He was a true martyr. He died because he would not close his eyes to facts, and because he put the authority of conscience above the authority of any human tribunal whatsoever.

We must not unduly blame the Council of Constance. It included men like Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, who were genuinely eager for reform. To them Hus appeared a revolutionary, a demagogue, a mischief-making nationalist. His burning eloquence and uncompromising methods seemed to them likely to do more harm than good. But they never gave him a fair hearing, and they altogether misjudged his character and his work. Nor did his gallant end open their eyes. Probably few of them saw it. The Council settled down to other business as John Hus went forth to die. Five hundred years ago he died; and of the fear of God and of fearlessness towards men *he being dead yet speaketh*.

AUTHORITIES.

The most important documents (including Letters) have been collected by F. Palacky, *Documenta J. Hus, vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi concilio* (1869).

The Letters have been translated into English and annotated by Workman & Pope (London, 1904).

The complete works have been edited by W. Flajšhaus (Prague, 1904).

The Acta of the Council of Constance are to be found in Mansi, *Concil. General.* Tom. XXVII.

Among the best accounts in English of the life and work of Hus are those of Rashdall (Stanhope Historical Essay, 1879), Neander (trans. J. Torrey, 1850-1858), Bishop Creighton (History of the Papacy, 1897), and Count Lützow, *The Life and Times of John Hus* (London, 1909). The short sketch by Black in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th edition, vol. xiv.) is a valuable summary, and he gives a useful bibliography.

GOD IS SPIRIT. *

By the Rev. JOHN GAMELE, B.D.

To-day we lift our minds to the Being upon whom our religion rests. We put aside all subordinate subjects and we think of the one within which they are all embraced and by which they are all controlled.

Who and what is God? What do we mean when we name the awful Name? Our minds may well be perplexed and baffled when we put these questions to ourselves. We are unable to give a satisfactory answer. We might, perhaps, have been ready with an answer when we were children. But we can no longer think of God as we did in childhood. The thought of Him has grown with our growth. When we were children we should have described Him as an all-powerful Being, who dwelt in a distant world, who controlled all things that happen, who kept the stars in their places, and to whom we shall have one day to give an account for what we do.

I think we should hardly be satisfied to use this simple language now. We have become much more alive to the vastness of the universe than we were when we were children, and we cannot imagine where this distant world can be which we then thought of as God's dwelling-place. Wherever our thoughts travel we find worlds like our own, and we say: "If God is not here in our midst, why should He be there?" "If we do not meet with Him here why should we suppose that we should find Him thousands, millions of miles off?" So there arises perplexity, misgiving, doubt. God seems to have lost the familiar form He once bore, to have become unapproachable, unthinkable, invisible like some star, once luminous, which has passed beyond the telescope's reach and which the astronomer, though he sweeps the heavens, can no

* Preached at St. Mary's, Leigh Woods, Clifton, on Trinity Sunday, May 30th, 1915.

more find. There must be some in every congregation for whom the great name of God does awaken these thoughts, and present these difficulties. Perhaps what I am about to say may help them to harmonize what they were taught in childhood with what they have since learned and experienced.

When we begin then to read the Bible with care, and to ask in real earnest what its words mean, we find that God is represented in its pages under two images. There are two likenesses under which He is pictured.

The first of these corresponds to the conception we had of Him when we were children. He is represented as a Being like ourselves, who inhabits a distant world and who comes down occasionally to the earth, walking in the garden in the cool of the day, descending to see the iniquity of the wicked cities, accepting the hospitality of Abraham at the tent-door. He is a Being separate from man, speaking to him from without, appearing in bodily shape and then disappearing. This image or conception of God meets us in all our prayers and hymns. They are all framed upon the belief that God is apart from us and that He has His permanent home not in this but in some distant world.

As we pass on, however, through the Bible from the earlier to the later books we find that this simple way of representing God ceases, and that the language used regarding Him becomes, if I may say so, more diffident and self-distrustful. Solomon dedicating the Temple, says, "The heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee, much less this house that I have built." Isaiah says, "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are His ways higher than our ways, and His thoughts than our thoughts." The Psalmist finds God not in one place but everywhere; in heaven and hell, and in the uttermost parts of the sea. What has happened is that the conception of God has become wider and vaster just as it does in our own case when we pass from youth to age. We find that the great Reality grows as we look. It is like a picture in which we see more and more, the more we gaze at it. It is not that this

Reality changes. It is that we change and see it more fully as our experience widens.

So we gradually learn an all-important lesson. We find that we cannot separate God from ourselves. He becomes to us what our minds make Him. Savage tribes represent Him as vindictive, cruel, partial. He cares for the members of their own tribe, and for no one beyond it. No one else can claim His protection. No one else is the object of His love and care. Civilized man knows that He has no favourites, and that all nations alike can claim His help. So as our own minds become nobler He assumes a nobler form.

So we reach the second of the two likenesses of God to be found in the Bible. In this He is represented, not as a Being apart from us, and inhabiting a distant world, but as present within our own Spirits, and as revealing Himself in the inner life of men.

This is the meaning of that great saying, "God is Spirit." This does not mean that He is a ghost or phantom who appears to us in dreams or visions. It means that He is of the same nature as that of which our own spirits are made, and that we see Him not with the eye of flesh but with the eye of the Spirit.

Now what I particularly ask you to observe is that while the earlier likeness of God—that of a great Being outside us—tends to break up and grow fainter and fainter with the growth of our minds—the second likeness becomes firmer and stronger. We cannot give Him form or shape. We make attempt after attempt to picture Him. One by one the attempts fail. We recognize that the task is impossible. At last we give it up. But the indwelling God becomes clearer and clearer as we think and live. We feel that He is with us, in us, an inseparable part of ourselves.

Both these conceptions of God are to be found in the Bible. Although the first is by far the more frequent one in the Old Testament, and perhaps the exclusive one in its earlier books, yet even in the Old Testament the thought of the Indwelling

Deity is by no means absent. It is, however, in the New Testament, and particularly in our Lord's teaching as recorded by St. John, that we find it most clearly expressed. He assures us that we need not travel into a distant world in order to find God, but that He will come and make His abode with us if we only follow Christ and keep His sayings. He tells us of a present heaven, entered by those in whose hearts God does thus dwell. He assures us that the union thus formed between us and the Eternal Father will not be broken by death. In every experience through which we shall have to pass, God's presence will go with us. His peace will keep us. We shall be safe within His arms.

I cannot follow this conception of God—as indwelling Spirit—into its many ramifications. Take but one thing. Look at the light it throws upon sin. Sin becomes, not an offence against a Being outside us, for which we shall have to pay a penalty, but an actual disturbance of our Nature, by which we separate ourselves from God and make it impossible for Him to dwell within our hearts. We shut the door upon Him and we feel ourselves to be in the outer darkness. Or look at that central truth of our Christianity—the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. What do we mean by this truth? We mean that God was in Christ exactly as He is in us, only in much greater fulness and power.

These are some of the consequences of this doctrine of the Indwelling God, but there are many others, and when we speak of this great subject we are profoundly conscious of the inadequacy of our words and thoughts to convey all that we feel and all that we would say if we could. Nevertheless the suggestions I have been able to give may enable some who may have thought that God was vanishing away from them to see re-appearing in their own inner life in their love of truth and reality, in their hatred of pretence, in all the movements of their Spiritual life, the very same Deity whom they thought they had lost, and to find that this faith is Christian, and is capable of being harmonized with all the teachings of their childhood.

Think of your inner life—your struggles with your lower self, your persistence after failure, the gradual loosening of your hold upon earthly things that you might trust yourself unreservedly to the Arms of your Heavenly Father. What solemnity do these experiences gain, how ennobling do they become, when you recognize them as the movements within your own breast of that Eternal Being who orders all things in Heaven and earth, and who is more intimately associated with us than the closest of earthly friends.

Let me close with some verses where this truth is expressed in poetical form, and which were suggested by some great words of St. Paul: "Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"

Is this thing true the preacher saith,
Or but a dreamer's dream?
Thrills in thy very midst the Breath
That bade the Star-fires stream,

Framed all the Universe Divine,
And slowly cell by cell
Built up thy body for a Shrine
Wherein Himself might dwell?

Then cares and fears be phantoms vain
Ills of illusion bred:
O hungry soul, insatiate brain
Ope inward and be fed.

O heart, with age-long error rife,
Thou art no soil for sin
Where through the Eternal Source of life
Wells ever from within!

Drink, and thy need shall be sufficed
The drought of death will fly,
Who thereof drinketh, saith the Christ,
Shall never thirst nor die.

REVIEW.

A LAYMAN'S RELIGION.

A very suggestive book, which may have a good deal of influence upon popular thought, has recently been published by Sir Francis Younghusband.* The writer believes that "the times are ripening for a renewing and deepening of religion"; that "there is much in the current religion which needs to be eliminated and discarded"; and that "through the process of elimination . . . there will emerge in generations to come a purer, a deeper, and a far more intimate and human religion than any which has gone before."

There is no doubt of the religious earnestness of the writer. Prayer and worship are necessary for man, and in the tenser life on which we are entering they will be more necessary than ever before. The religion which has inspired the lives of great men must have something in it of supreme value, and what is great and of value in it must be preserved as the most precious heritage of the race.

With much in the book any thinker must agree. But the general drift of the writer's ideas is such that, while there is the greatest appreciation of the power and necessity of religion, it undermines the very foundations on which any true religion may rest. "God" is a personification of the "mutual influence" between all the component parts of man and nature; He is the totality of things; apart from the universe He does not exist; He is the necessary creation of man's mind; man in nature is the real and only creator; the sum total of all influences in nature and man is the only God.

It is not true Pantheism, for there is really no God. It is the materialism of Lucretius, with an attempt at showing why man of necessity must make a God, as the expression of his own ideals. The book is remarkable as showing the necessity of postulating religion, though the philosophy is materialistic.

God is the immanent power in the universe, but there is no transcendent Personality. There is nothing needed outside the universe; it is its own Cause and End. And there is no immortality, at any rate in any personal sense. Man creates the future, as the power within him has created the past. Evolution has been a self-creative process, and the future is an unending process of creation by the unfettered purposefulness inherent in the world.

Everything has developed from the atoms and electrons by their inherent nature. Unity and Harmony have shewn themselves more stable than chaos, and the general trend of things, though without purpose, has been for good. The future development, we may also believe—though it is a matter of faith—will be towards increasing harmony and good.

* *Mutual Influence*. Williams & Norgate, 3/- net.

All this results from the analysis of phenomena as we see them. By scientific observation the electron is the smallest element at which we can arrive. Everything has developed from the inherent nature of the electrons, and there is no ground for supposing anything outside. There is only a closed system of electronic units, and beyond this there is no God. The only God is the whole world-power, the mutual influence of one unit upon another.

Presumably, then, thought, spiritual or psychic powers are all electronic. Notwithstanding our utter ignorance of the real nature of an electron, that explains and accounts for all. The electron is "immaterial;" it is nothing visible, or tangible. It is "simply a vortex of imponderable ether, a mere centre of energy; and what ether is, and what energy is, beyond mere convenient expressions, no man can yet say." But our last analysis brings us to the point that everything is the result of the incessant motion of immaterial electrons, the nature of which no one yet knows.

The writer is obsessed by the thought that there is no other alternative between belief in God as the Mutual Influence of spontaneously active parts upon one another, and God as a Perfect Being directing, controlling, and guiding from outside. Over and over again the reader is asked to choose between the horns of this dilemma. It is either a separate Personal Being wholly outside men, living in the Heavens, or it is the immanent Power resulting from the mutual influence of all men, and of all the component parts of the universe. It is either some external Being as separate and distinct a Person from themselves as a father is from his children, directing and manipulating from outside the forces of nature, using the forces of nature to thwart or to encourage human endeavours, or it is the whole considered as a process, itself enduring continuously, and being continually bettered.

Now, no religious philosopher of any depth has ever postulated such a Being, who simply manipulates the world from outside, and interferes according to His pleasure. All religion of any depth believes in God as immanent. The Christian religion is based on the idea of incarnation, and the Hebrew religion saw in all the processes of nature the working of the unseen God. The winds were His messengers, the thunder His voice, and the breath of the Lord the life of His creatures.

The dilemma is not exclusive. We may believe, as did the Hebrews, in the immanence of God in His whole creation, that the creation is the working out of His purpose, and still believe that the phenomenal world does not exhaust God, is not the only God. The material world may still rest on a spiritual world, as the basis of its reality, and that spiritual world may be still working through the material world. It may be the real Power at the bottom of the creative evolution of this world, as the invisible air is necessary to the sustenance of human material life. Does the electron itself require to be sustained in its life and movement by something not yet discovered? The basis of this force—energy, life, spirit, immateriality, incessant motion—has yet to be explained. The premises are not enough to support the conclusion. The scientific description of the way in which the electrons have evolved is still only a descriptive materialism. It is not an explanation. And if the creative evolution that we can observe is dependent

on Free Will, the power of Choice, it seems that we must predicate some kind of Will of Choice to the primitive electron.

Whence came thought? Whence came ideals? Whence came the desire for prayer and worship, so necessary to man? Are all these contained in the primitive electron? No kind of materialism can explain these things.

Rather the evidence points to the fact that the electrons are but phenomena—the impression made on our senses by the Reality behind that eludes sensation, that the Reality behind is not material (if that word still has any meaning), but is the source of Will, Choice, Thought, Purpose—is in itself the Supreme Purpose, the Fount and Basis of all Being, the Life of Life, and the Soul of Soul. That the development of the world has not been so blindly groping as it appears, but that through the ages one unceasing purpose runs, working by its very nature for good.

It may be that new discoveries as to the nature of thought, the nature of influence, the possibilities of transmission of thought, the power of prayer, may give us a better understanding of the link between the "material" and the spiritual world, but the existence of a spiritual world, beyond, and yet permeating the visible world, is the only hypothesis that gives any semblance of an explanation of the facts to be accounted for.

There may be universes beyond our ken. The Soul immanent in matter may have other manifestations, cognisable only by the spirit. The mystery of the Soul of this world only deepens the mystery, and makes it impossible for a man to say: "There is no God."

God, the explanation of all things, is not exhausted by our seeing. The material world does not exhaust His essence. He is transcendent beyond His Immanence. His ways are still past finding out, though we can feel the presence of the Power "over all, and in all, and through all."

So the book leaves us cold. It provides no real basis of religion. It is cosmic emotion—science tinged with religion, and feeling after deeper truth. The tone at the end of the book of adoration and worship seems strangely without foundation from the arguments contained in the premises.

Nature and man, even in their wonderful totality, cannot be worshipped. They require other explanation. The only explanation that can satisfy is that the material universe is but the manifestation of a deeper underlying spiritual universe, which we can dimly grasp by the touch of faith and feeling, of which God is the centre, the Source of Life, and the Undying Eternal.

A. J. HUMPHREYS, B.D.

CORRESPONDENCE.

IN PREPARATION FOR THE NEXT LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

SIR, *To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.*

It is true, indeed, that, as I read in the current number of the *Modern Churchman*, the historical basis of the doctrines promulgated by the new exclusive and reactionary Catholic (*sic*) School has been completely under-

mined by recent investigation, but who are aware of this save a few open minded students? Would it not be most opportune if the Council of the Churchmen's Union could arrange for the publication of one or two manuals in which the results arrived at by the researches of scholars of undoubted authority would be plainly set forth—little books which would be cheap, popular in style, and scholarly enough to command respect at a S.S.S. meeting. Such books may already exist, and if so, many readers of the *Modern Churchman*, I am sure, would be grateful for a list of them with brief comments.

The new light, which our clergy are often too prejudiced to be able to accept, would be welcomed by the religious layman whose influence in the Church is likely to be enhanced after the war is over.

Penny pamphlets, if accurate, well balanced, and written in good nervous English, are greatly needed also for the enlightenment of the man in the street.

HEADMASTER.

DIVINE PROVIDENCE.

SIR,

TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman*.

Mr. Symonds will find an excellent article on the above in the *Modern Churchman* for June, 1913, by the Rev. C. F. Russell. As I have just been expressing my own views in the *Interpreter* for July, I must not trouble you with them here. But I should like to be allowed to point out that "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in (or wait for) him," is a curious mistranslation. The right rendering is probably that of the American Revisers:—"Behold he will slay me; I have no hope."

Matt. v. 45, and Luke xiii. 1-5, are important, and there are interesting passages in Archbishop Whately's *Life*, vol. i., p. 134; and in *Lorna Doone*, ch. xiv., where John Ridd holds forth on the supposed connection between Popery and the weather:—"Besides, why could not Providence settle the business once for all by freezing the Pope himself: even though (according to our view) he were destined to extremes of heat, together with all who followed him?"

T. F. ROYDS.

Bollington Vicarage, Altrincham.

[We have unfortunately no space for letters from Rev. J. Bulkeley, Mr. H. A. Bulley, and Rev. C. W. Emmet, on the exact significance of the precept: "Love your enemies."

We regret also being unable, for the same reason, to publish a letter from Canon Edwards Rees, D.D., protesting strongly against Parliamentary control of the Church and the retention of the *status quo* as advocated by Rev. A. Fawkes in our last issue.

We are particularly sorry to find no space for a letter from Mr. Arthur Davies, of Madras, who feels that the Churchmen's Union in deliberately excluding Nonconformists from its ranks is making a profound mistake.

No correspondence will be published in our next number.—
ED. M.C.